DANIELL

ON

BAPTISM & COMMUNION

BAP
D1855w

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCC
8003

Contents of this volume.

What is Baptism? by Daniell. p.p. 27.

Revelation the Sole basis of Church Discipline. by Daniell ——— " " 62.

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

THE SUBSTANCE OF

A SERMON

PREACHED MAY 27, 1838,

BY THE

REV. MORTLOCK DANIELL,

MINISTER AT BEULAH CHAPEL, RAMSGATE.

"It cannot be proved, by the sacred Scriptures, that Infant Baptism was instituted by Christ." LUTHER.

"There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament, for the baptism of Infants." BISHOP BURNET.

LONDON:

T. GARDINER & SON, 20, PRINCES STREET,

CAVENDISH SQUARE.

M.DCCC.XXXVIII.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. APR 18 1881
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

On this occasion, it is not my intention to confine myself to any specific text; and I know not any passage of Holy Scripture that would censure me, if this were my uniform practice—so that I need offer no apology for the course I now pursue.

My subject will be Baptism; and in its discussion, there are two extremes which I would studiously avoid. On the one hand, I would censure that spirit of liberalism that allows the disciple to be his own Lord and Master, suffering him to neglect and regard just what ordinances he may choose, and conceding to him the right of accommodating the institutions of Christ to his personal preferences. On the other hand, I would equally oppose that despicable dogmatism, that supposes all excellency to be comprehended in its own party, or to be confined to its own peculiar denomination.

I gladly acknowledge that many, who differ from me, both in sentiment and practice, on the rite of Baptism, are among the excellent of the earth, and the feelings of Christian esteem, which I bear towards them, inspire me with a solicitude that they should be guided into all truth. Nevertheless, neither the charity, nor the humility, nor the longsuffering of the Gospel, require me, on account of my love to them, to shrink from the defence of

an ordinance which I deem to be scriptural and important, or from the mild and yet firm exposure of human inventions and innovations which I consider injurious and fatal—If the traditions of men subvert the institutions of Christ, the Head of the church is offended, and the church herself is deluded.

Whether, my hearers, you concur with me, or not, I unreservedly affirm, as the result of my observation, so far as it has extended, that, notwithstanding the march of Christianity through the length and breadth of the land; notwithstanding the rapid strides of Evangelicism, and the increased observance of the external forms of Godliness, there never was a day when primitive discipline was more outraged—when the practical part of the New Testament was more slighted—when free grace doctrines and inspired examples were more invaded. Of course I do not include those times when the man of sin exchanged the realities of truth, for the mummeries of superstition, and made himself drunk with the blood of the martyred saints—but I refer to those days wherein Protestantism has secured to us the blessed majesty of freedom, and left us, unmolested by our enemies, to enjoy and circulate her glory. And looking back, through the remembrancer of History, I invariably find, the longer the calm, the more lazy the crew, and the louder the storm the more persevering the ship—and as our sea has been so long becalmed, as the surface of the waters has so long been smooth, as our prospects have been so long peaceful, as our sky has so long exhibited an almost cloudless azure, it is to this I attribute that lamentable deficiency in primitive observances of which I complain.

Do not suppose that I am here this evening, mantled in the trappings of controversy, to espouse, with a tone

of infallibility, or with the partial and misguided zeal of the bigot, one system of man, against another system of man, one ordinance of human election against another ordinance of human election, one *un*inspired rite, against another *un*inspired rite—No, this would simply be the will of man against the will of man, the word of man against the word of man, human opinion and preference against human opinion and preference, and consequently it would be altogether unimportant at what conclusion you might arrive, or whether you determined to espouse the system advocated either by A or by B.

But I am here with the word of truth—with the power of God—with the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left—and I beseech you with all pureness, meekness, and love unfeigned, *not* to listen to the uncertain voice of transient popularity, *not* to be awed by the force of fashion, custom, or prejudice, *not* to be regulated by the modern usage of the Church of England, neither by *our* word, by *our* creed, or by *our* party—BUT ONLY BY THIS BIBLE.

Covet neither the names Episcopalian, Independent, Methodist, nor Baptist, for the sake of a name or a sect; these are only names written in the sands of time, which the rolling flood of eternity will efface—but covet earnestly that unreserved and uneclipsed obedience to Christ, which his love to you so richly deserves, and which his authority so clearly demands.

I. BAPTISM IS AN ORDINANCE WHICH JESUS CHRIST HAS DIGNIFIED BY HIS OWN EXAMPLE.

In the third Chapter of St. Matthew, and from the thirteenth verse, it is thus written: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him.

But John forbad him, saying I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

There can therefore be no controversy whether Jesus Christ was baptized or not, or whether he was *immersed* or *sprinkled.* Divine revelation assures he was baptized, and common sense decides, if he had only been sprinkled, he would not have deemed it necessary to descend into the river. Had we no other portion of the New Testament to sustain our proposition, this would be sufficient to testify, firstly, the fact of our Lord's Baptism; and, secondly, that the mode of his baptism was *immersion.* But more of the mode hereafter.

Mark i. chapter, 9—11 verses, and Luke iii. chapter, 21 verse, (passages to which time will not allow me to refer) are additional testimonies of our Saviour's baptism—and I need only observe, although the brief account given by the three Evangelists varies, in the form of its narration, all unite in assuring us of the same interesting facts.

Now the reason I have introduced this as the first proposition, is because I always feel happy and safe in the company of my Saviour, and when I am sure I am treading in the track he has trodden before me, I think I have nothing to fear—If I am told the popular voice is against me, I reply, the popular voice was against my

Redeemer, and I would rather be in the minority, with the example of Jesus to sustain me, than in an overwhelming majority without one scriptural precept or precedent to sanction me.

Remember, therefore, if you are ashamed of adult Baptism—if you term it either indelicate or superfluous—you are not only opposing yourself to primitive discipline, but to the example of Christ himself—and you consequently infer that Jesus in pursuing such a ceremony espoused it without necessity. Your objections are not confined to those who practise, but they extend to him who instituted the rite. You leave yourselves only these two alternatives, from which you must choose one; either that Christ's example was superfluous, or that your non-conformity is censurable.

II. BAPTISM IS AN ORDINANCE OF PERPETUAL OBLIGATION.

That this ordinance was not confined to Jesus Christ, or restricted to believers in that age, is evident from the commission which our Lord gave to his disciples after his resurrection. And, surely, if there be any "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn"—if there be any language emphatic, moving the mind of the christian into willing compliance, it should be the language of Him, who having just conquered Satan, and overcome the bitterness of death, before he ascended to the right-hand of the Majesty on high, commanded the continuance of certain ordinances until the period of his second advent.

In the xxviii chapter of St. Matthew, and the 19 and 20 verses, it is written—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you

and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." And in the xvi chapter of St. Mark, and the 15 and 16 verses, we have words to the same effect: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. It is apparent the commission extends to all nations, and in all ages, to the termination of this dispensation—and as our Saviour, so intimately connects "*believing*" and "*baptizing*" there cannot be the shadow of a doubt, but that he intended the union to be maintained inviolate to the end of the world. As though the eye of Jesus, looking through succeeding centuries, had pre-pictured, when the north should give up, when the south should no longer keep back, when the east and the west should surrender themselves to his commands, through a supernatural influence and change—Or as though he had preconceived the day when Britain should no more be the neglected desert for the prowling of the savage quadruped, but an Island for the cultivation of the trees of his right hand planting, and an enclosure for a great proportion of his redeemed ones to observe his institutions.

And you will remark, there is no parenthesis in our Lord's injunction, making a distinction between an eastern and western climate, as though any thing were to be feared from the chill of an element—Or between the polished and unpolished condition of men—between the servant and the master—between the classic and the rustic—as though what were propriety in the one, would be *im*propriety in the other. On the contrary there is but one clear, definite, and unrepealed law, which is of perpetual obligation among Christians, without any reference whatever either to clime, rank, wealth, beauty, sex, or age.

My brethren, let me ask you, is it compatible with the wisdom of our Divine Redeemer to suppose that he enjoined ordinances upon his followers, without at the same time contemplating difference of climate, and station, or the disparity between the uncultivated and the refined? And surely if these foreseen and foreknown discrepancies, had rendered any exception or alteration expedient, such an one would have been appendaged by him, who is justly jealous of his prerogative, as Lawgiver to his people.

And let me assure you, that *refinement* which perceives indelicacy where Jesus Christ perceives none, is a *false refinement*, originating in the depravity of the mind that contemplates it. And that *penetration* which fancies it discerns superfluity, where Jesus Christ discerns none, is a *false penetration*, originating in the partial blindness of the eye that discovers it. And that *inference*, which infers something from the commands of Christ, which boldly invades those commands, is a *false* inference, originating in the ignorance of him who espouses it. Refinement, Superfluity, and Inference are formidable weapons in the estimation of the misled Giant, Error; but Truth enters the field with simply her sling and stone, and at the very outset of the conflict the Giant—Error falls—"Truth fears nothing but concealment."

Inasmuch then as the preaching of the Gospel, and the baptizing of Believers, are both included in the same commission—inasmuch as the *perpetuity* of both, is expressed in the same language—if there be a plea for the abolition of the latter, the same plea will suffice for the abrogation of the former—For if Jesus Christ has told his Ministers to preach and baptize, to the end of the world, certainly the ordinance of baptism is so interlinked with the preaching of the Gospel, that to divide them

is to divide the commands of Christ. Consequently nothing can be scripturally adduced, as a reason for the repeal of the rite of Baptism—which may not be as scripturally urged as a reason for the suspension of the Gospel.

III. BAPTISM IS AN ORDINANCE RESTRICTED TO BELIEVERS.

The restriction of the ordinance is as conspicuous as its perpetuity—and is embodied in the commission we have already quoted—"Go ye forth, and teach all nations, baptizing them" &c. You will perceive the features of discipleship were to precede the administration of baptism; as though Christ had said, first teach them, and then baptize them, and then continue to teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded you. This appears to me a consistent paraphrase—but if any individual should deem it inconclusive, I am prepared to defend it with the whole artillery of Revelation—and I shall therefore refer you to the following passages.

Acts, ii *Chap.* 37—41 *verses*—"Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the Apostles—Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children (*not universally*) and to all that are afar off (*not universally*) *even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." From this account, it appears, the ordinance of baptism, was restricted to those who were "pricked in their hearts," who "repented," and "gladly received" the Gospel—and not indiscriminately administered to the multitude.

Acts viii *Chap.* 35—39 *verses*—" Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, IF THOU BELIEVEST WITH ALL THINE HEART THOU MAYEST. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him." Now just remember the question proposed by the eunuch, " See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" and the reply of Philip, " If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Plainly intimating if he were an unbeliever, if he had no faith, or if that faith did not work by love, he was not a proper subject to be baptized. But if he did believe, and that with all his heart, then there was no impediment. He was not baptized because he had been a sinner, but because he had become a saint—not because he was within the sound of the Gospel, but because he had received that Gospel in power to the salvation of his soul. Every unprejudiced reader must perceive that Philip introduced *faith* to the eunuch, as a condition of baptism, and that had the eunuch disavowed the possession of such a principle, he could not have been conducted into this ordinance of Christianity.

Acts viii *Chap.* 12, 13 *verses*—" *But when they believed* Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. Then Simon himself *believed* also: and when he was baptized he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were

done." From this passage, you perceive that the very people of Samaria, who had been bewitched by the sorceries of Simon, were convinced under the preaching of Philip, and believed in the name of Jesus—and as believers were baptized. Simon finding that his artifices would no longer succeed, and that he could not enrich himself by the continuance of his impositions, professed to believe also, and upon that profession was baptized. It was soon discernible that he was insincere, that he had been actuated by carnal motives, and had only put on an external garb of religion as the most likely plan to deceive the people. Thus Peter plainly told him, his heart was not right in the sight of God, that he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. You cannot however fail to discern that *a profession of faith* was the forerunner of his baptism, and had he not assumed the character of "*believer*" he would have found no admission into the Church of Christ. Philip received him into fellowship, just as our Lord received Judas, simply upon an outward profession—our Lord came not to judge the world, and therefore he did not suspect his motive.—Philip had neither the prerogative nor the ability to search the heart, and therefore was bound to receive Simon upon his verbal testimony. Had he known his *real* character he would not have baptized him.

Acts x *Chap.* 47 *verse.*—"Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." It appears from the context, that while Peter was speaking to them, the Holy Ghost fell upon them, and so soon as they magnified God, and gave evidence of their faith in Christ, notwithstanding they were Gentiles,

the believing Jews hailed them as believing brethren, and introduced them to the ordinances they estemed. Peter pleaded before his Jewish brethren the fact of the Gentiles having received the Holy Ghost, as a qualification for their participation in spiritual institutions. Now I appeal to your candour, whether the passages to which I have referred you do not authorize me to affirm that baptism is an ordinance restricted to believers, inasmuch as the discipline observed by the Apostles involved such a principle, and since that period, no extension of the rite has been authorized by Jesus Christ?

Nor does the fact of the baptism of a household at all militate against the restriction of the ordinance to believers, but rather confirms it—You read of three baptized households in the New Testament—that of the jailor—that of Stephanas—that of Lydia Concerning that of the Jailor, we are expressly told they were all believers—that they were all preached unto—and that they were all baptized. In the xvi chapter of Acts and 32 verse we find that Paul and Silas spake to *all* that were in his house--in the 33 verse we find, *he and all his were baptized* straightway—and in the 34 verse we find, he rejoiced, *believing in God with all his house.* And thus it is evident the *faith* was as *universal* as the *baptism*—and if you suppose there were infants in this household, you must at least admit they were believers, or, if you say, they had no faith, consistency requires you to add, they were not aptized—But revelation assures us that all in the house heard the gospel, that all in the house believed, that all in the house were baptized—and therefore we conclude it contained neither infants, nor little children.

Concerning the household of Stephanas, baptized by

St. Paul, it is fair to infer they were all members of the church at Corinth, for the Apostle, when he mentions the household of Stephanas is enumerating those whom he had baptized there, and who were connected with that church, otherwise there would have been no force or propriety in mentioning such names—but if there were any doubt on the subject, as to whether they were all believers, it is removed in the xvi chapter of the same epistle and 15 verse, where the Apostle says "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." I ask you whether such a household must not consist of persons who had arrived at years of discretion—persons who were renewed in the spirit of their minds—persons who were taught by the Holy Ghost, or how could they have been the first fruits of Achaia, or have possessed a disposition to minister to the saints? Their labor of love is a proof of their personal faith.

Concerning the household of Lydia, Scripture is silent—but who is prepared to prove she was married? Or if married, who is prepared to prove she had children? Or if she had children, who is prepared to prove they were not believers? Now these things must be proved before the Pædo-Baptist can fairly infer a precedent for his practice. He must prove that Lydia was married—he must prove that she had children—he must prove that one was in a stage of infancy—three things which he can *never* prove—before he can plead the household of Lydia in defence of his system. The fact of the household being designated Lydia's is almost an assurance that she had no husband, for it is a well known truth, that

the household is not denominated after the wife but after the husband.

Thus upon a review of the *three* households, we find that *two* of them are described as households of *believers*. And as regards the third, both the analogy of Scripture, and the narrative itself are on our side. Who indeed would draw an inference from the silence of Scripture, that should contravene its own declarations? Or who would plead for an ordinance upon premises so questionable? Happily for us the ordinances of Christianity are not left to human inference or conjecture, but are explicitly prescribed by Jesus Christ.

And is there any thing preposterous or unlikely, in the supposition of three households being destitute of infants and children? When I look at this assembly, I immediately recognize three, and more than three households, in which there is neither infant nor child. And if I can pereive in this congregation several households, all of whose members have arrived at years of discretion, is it at all improbable that two should have been found at Thyatira, and one at Corinth? When however I find my brethren, the Pædo-Baptists, venturing upon so sandy a foundation, I can only conclude they would occupy premises more solid, if they could discover them. So that the weakness of their argument proves it erroneous.

It is highly inconsistent to suppose that carnal persons can have any scriptural interest in the ordinances of Christ. A vital union must precede communion with him, and the new heart must be the invariable qualification to spiritual obedience—The Jewish church recognized, in its very constitution, the membership of carnal persons; it did not make a distinction between those born

after the flesh, and those born after the spirit. There was no law to exclude the Pharisee, or even the Sadducee, although their doctrines and practices were condemned. But the church of Christ under this dispensation, corrupts not herself by receiving such persons as are carnal, and provides for their exclusion if they creep in unawares.

You must not suppose the discipline of the Jewish Church is the pattern for the discipline of the church of Christ. If it be, why do we read, or speak of a *new* dispensation? If the ceremonies and customs of the Jews are our examples, then I contend it is not a *new* dispensation, but the *old* dispensation remodelled and amended. And when believing Gentiles, incline at all towards the errors of the *un*believing Jews, by consulting the Old Testament instead of the New, then like the *un*believing Jews, their conclusions are mistaken.

Under the old dispensation, the Church was national—under this dispensation, we are told, "there is neither Jew nor Greek"—under the old dispensation the ceremonies of the church, many of them involved a sexual distinction—under this dispensation, we learn "there is neither male nor female"—under the old dispensation, to be born of Jewish parents entitled such an one to admission into the church—but under this dispensation, the only scriptural basis of entrance is to be born of God!

On this point the Apostle writes expressly (2 Cor. vi ch. 14 ver.) "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?

Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel;—* * * Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you &c." Such passages as these, frequently found in the New Testament, plainly demonstrate that the church of Christ is not national but spiritual—and spiritual persons, having only been received into the church in the days of the Apostles, as the dispensation is not changed, neither blended with the one that preceded it, all carnal persons should be denied, having no principle of faith, nor fitness for communion.

IV. BAPTISM, AN ORDINANCE ONLY DULY ADMINISTERED BY IMMERSION.

As regards the etymology of the word baptize, I shall not occupy our time with any extended observations—but simply remark that the learned Parkhurst, who was a judicious and consistent Episcopalian, and whose memory is endeared by his critical research and attainments, tells us that *Baptizo* signifies to dip, to immerse to plunge—to wash the hands by immersion, or by dipping them in water—nor does he, though a churchman, add—to sprinkle. His consistency led him to perceive and record the distinction between *baptizo* to baptize or immerse, and *rantizo* to sprinkle.

And if you consult the form of the church of England, you will find the Priest has instructions to dip "the child in the water discreetly and warily." and therefore it is obvious every time the Episcopalian sprinkles an Infant, he not only does violence to the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as Parkhurst admits, but also departs from the precepts of his own Church. In all the old

churches, you find large fonts which are sufficiently capacious to *immerse* an infant, and which according to the laws of the Church of England, should be "*filled* with pure water" when the ordinance is administered—so that a minister in the establishment, in sprinkling a child, runs counter to the instructions contained in his own book of prayer. Here it may not be amiss to read you a quotation which I have penned from the celebrated Episcopalian, Whitby—"Immersion being religiously observed *by all christians* for THIRTEEN CENTURIES, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any licence from any council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and sprinkling only permitted, as of old, in case of the clinici, or in danger of death."

Consulting the New Testament, we find immersion was the only mode of administration—Why did Jesus go into the river Jordan, if immersion were unnecessary? Why was John baptizing in Enon, near to Salem, because there was much water there, if much water were superfluous? Why did the eunuch descend from the chariot, and go down into the water, if immersion were not the mode? If baptism had not been by immersion, there can be no adequate reason assigned for the custom of repairing to the rivers. Can sober judgement or common sense suppose, if a cup full of water would have sufficed for baptism, the multitudes would have acted as they did?

And when Paul speaks of being *buried* with Christ by *baptism* into death; we ask, what accuracy, or what em-

phasis in the expression, if baptism were not by immersion? If the rite were performed by sprinkling, could it be called a burial? How can that be buried or covered that is not immersed? Obviously, therefore, *immersion was the mode*, and as no inspired authority has instituted a change *immersion is the mode*, and *will be* the mode to the world's end.

And if, my brethren, you ask me why I contend so strenuously for the mode, as though it were so essential, I reply, because the mode is the ordinance, and cannot be separated from it. If you immerse you baptize, if you sprinkle, you do not baptize at all—and therefore if I give up the mode of immersion, I, at the same time, give up the ordinance itself. Moreover I maintain that baptism is not an unmeaning ceremony—that it has an interesting signification—that it sets forth the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the candidate's fellowship with him, and interest in all the benefits of his humiliation. Now if there be no immersion, the ideas of death, burial, and resurrection are entirely obscured, as in the act of sprinkling, neither the one nor the other is signified—so that you will do me the justice to acknowledge, I am not pleading for a certain form simply as a form, but as a form which so implicates the ordinance itself, as to destroy its spiritual signification, if it be effaced or altered.

Baptism, duly administered, points us to the baptism of Jesus' suffering—to the baptism of blood—to all that is affecting and yet animating—but when sprinkling is substituted, the ceremony is without signification. If you could retain the thing signified, in the alteration of the mode, the alteration of the mode would not be so *fatal;* but even then, it would be *inadmissible*, as we have no

discretionary power in the administration of Christ's institutions. But inasmuch as to vary the mode, is to remove all that is endearing, and instructing, and significant from the ordinance, it need not be wondered that I lay such an emphasis upon the act of immersion.

Having thus briefly referred to the radical import of baptism—to the mode adopted by the Established Church for more than one thousand three hundred years—to the spiritual signification of the institution, all conspire to lend their support to *immersion* as the only mode by which baptism is duly administered. To regard a rite without any signification can be neither scriptural nor profitable. In the ordinance of the Supper, through the elements, we contemplate the body and blood of Jesus Christ—and in the ordinance of Baptism, through the form, we contemplate the death and resurrection of our Redeemer—but we affirm, so soon as the *mode* of administering baptism is invaded by sprinkling, so soon the signification of the ceremony is expunged—and therefore our Pædo-Baptist brethren implicate themselves in a form which is not only without biblical precedent, but without any reasonable import!

V. BAPTISM AN ORDINANCE ENTIRELY AT VARIANCE WITH INFANT SPRINKLING.

Our subject is too often passed by with such inconsistent utterances as these :—"it is immaterial whether we are baptized or sprinkled," or, "baptism and sprinkling may both be right"—or "do not let us be too particular about trifles!"—Trifles! who dares to designate these institutions of Christ, trifles! Surely the practise of the primitives maintains the contrary. My brethren, if there be an important difference between truth and error, if there be an

important difference between a Divine command, and a human invention—then there must be an important difference between the baptism of believers, and the sprinkling of infants.

Infant sprinkling is not to be found in the New Testament. If you can find only one passage of Scripture directly commanding, or fairly inferring, the sprinkling of infants, I will concede the point immediately. If it were the command of Christ, or the practice of the Apostles, snrely it is to be found in the inspired page. Search the scriptures, in a spirit of prayer, and if you find infant sprinkling, believe it; but if you cannot find it, believe it not. It is true, we read, that Jesus said "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." But we are not told that he sprinkled them, or gave directions to that effect—nor were they brought unto him for that purpose—but simply, it is said, that he should pray with them. He often alluded to little children, but it was with the intention of communicating *spiritual* instruction to his disciples, whom he wished to possess more of an humble, teachable, unsuspecting and child-like disposition. There is no allusion to baptism in any verse in the chapter—(see Matthew xix ch. 13 verse).

Infant sprinkling has no relation whatever to circumcision. If among other explanations which the Apostle gave to the Hebrews, when he endeavoured to shew them the spiritual application of their rites and ceremonies, he had introduced Infant Sprinkling under the new dispensation, as a substitute for circumcision under the old, there would have been no justice in supposing otherwise; but to say the least, if it be not presumption, it is inconsistent, for men to make comparisons, and introduce applications to

answer their ends, where the Scripture is altogether silent. But how much greater is that inconsistency, when the Scriptures are *not* silent, and when human applications positively invalidate what the Scriptures declare! Now the Scriptures are not silent as to the spiritual import of Circumcision—they do not leave it to the inference of men—but St. Paul tells us, Romans ii chap. 28, 29 ver. "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and *circumcision is that of the heart*, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Hence it appears that the rite of circumcision was a type not of Infant sprinkling, but of Regeneration, according to the words of the same Apostle elsewhere. "We are the true circumcision who worship God in the spirit, who rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." And elsewhere, "Circumcision availeth nothing, neither uncircumcision, *but a new creature*."

Now although the Holy Spirit reveals that the regeneration of the spiritual Israel was the thing signified by the circumcision of the national Israel, human opinion ventures to dissent or to append, and in some extraordinary, intrusive, and uninspired way, to deduce the sprinkling of Infants from the ancient ceremony. But here let me affirm, as Holy Scripture reveals no connection whatever between the circumcision of an infant, under the former dispensation, and the sprinkling of an infant under the present, it is an affinity of human assumption, and consequently unsound.

Infant sprinkling brings the world into the church. If the rite of baptism be the admission into the Church of Christ, and this rite be extended to babes born in sin,

and shapen in iniquity, fallen and carnal, certainly the church and the world are blended. Baptism should be the *manifest* line of demarcation between the church and the world, between the renewed and the unrenewed, but the introduction of the sprinkling of Infants destroys its efficiency. Surely all who believe the doctrines of the Gospel, must know that religion is not hereditary—that Christianity is not national, or based upon earthly ties—that there is no difference, by nature, between the child of a believer, and the child of an unbeliever. And yet many plead the faith of the parent, or of the Godfather, as available to the infant, and thereby contravene in practice what they admit in sentiment. Let the parent train up the child in the way he should go, but let him not suppose his child can be advantaged by a ceremony, about which the Scriptures are silent, and in which his child is implicated before the development of intellect or reason.

Under this dispensation, all religion is personal—and that good men and women in the nineteenth century, (I say good men and women, for I wish not to impeach their piety, while I condemn their practice) should promise, in the name of an unconscious babe, that he shall, in youth and manhood, "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh"—is a most affecting thought, and a most lamentable proof of the thick darkness that yet overspreads us. That the child should then be signed with the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end"—adds much to the distressing aspect of the scene. But

that the minister should then pronounce these words, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this child is regenerate,* and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord, make our prayers unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning" is so awful and untrue that I almost tremble to repeat it. I cannot with some pronounce it ridiculous—it is too affecting for such an adjective—but I could weep over it, as the maximum of a Christian's ignorance.

What means it, my brethren, but the sinful amalgamation of the world with the church—and what is it, but a fruitless attempt to make the kingdom of Christ co-extensive with the kingdom of intelligence, upon most *un*scriptnral principles?

The Independent may, it is true, justly plead "not guilty" to many censurable parts in the service of the Episcopalian—he dispenses with God-fathers, and God-mothers, with the signing in the form of the cross—nor does he pronounce the sprinkled Infant, regenerate—And if we ask him, why he dispenses with these, he replies, because he finds no mention of them in the Bible. Why not then dispense with the ceremony in toto? Can he find *any part* of it in the Bible?

But let the Independent remember, while in comparing himself, or rather his ceremony, with that of the Episcopalian, he is not equally inconsistent—nevertheless like the Episcopalian he substitutes human inference for divine revelation! He changes the *mode* of the ordinance, from immersion into sprinkling—he changes the *subject* of the ordinance from a penitent believer to an unconcious carnal babe—he changes the *signification* of

the ordinance from the interesting to the unmeaning. And having thus changed both the *mode*, the *subject* and the *signification*, he has lost the primitive ordinance of Christ, in the cloud of human invention and device.

Infant sprinkling only tells us a sinner is born—believer's baptism tells us a sinner is born again. Infant sprinkling only tells us the nation is increased, believer's baptism tells us the kingdom of Christ is advanced. Infant sprinkling only advertizes an entrance into the world, believer's baptism advertizes an entrance into the church. Infant sprinkling is only a sign of personal depravity—but believer's baptism, is, as the Episcopalian says "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace" Infant sprinkling is the device of man, believer's baptism is the institution of Jesus Christ.—Judge then my hearers, whether the one is not at variance with the other, and no longer deem it immaterial whether you are decided for Christ, for truth, for Revelation and for Conscience.

In conclusion let me ask you, are you a Christian? If you are not a praying penitent, let me entreat you to look to Christ, "whom God hath exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to grant us repentance and the remission of sins," Remember unless Christ be your Saviour you must be eternally lost. And if you *are* a Christian, if you have the witness in yourself that you are born of God, let me ask you, have you been baptized?

Do you answer, it is not essential? I reply it is essential to christian *consistency*, though not essential to christian *character*. Jesus Christ thought it essential for he instituted nothing superfluous. It is essential to *obedience*, though not essential to *salvation*. And do you think it respectful or affectionate to say of Jesus Christ's

commands, "they are not essential"? Are you prepared to tell him so, when you see him face to face? If not, why tell his minister so? Why neglect them? It is the very essence of Antinomianism to disregard the institutions of our Redeemer, because we may be saved without observing them. Make haste, and delay not, I beseech you, to keep his commandments, for they are not grievous but joyous. There is a future judgement for saints as well as for sinners—for the godly as well as the ungodly—therefore aim so to acknowledge the authority of Jesus Christ, that you may not be beaten with many stripes.

I repeat the question—HAVE YOU BEEN BAPTIZED?—*Do you answer you are too advanced in life.*—Suffer me to say you are not much advanced in the *divine* life, if this be your excuse—Can the Believer be too old to be obedient to Christ? Is age a plea for disobedience? Is not the promise, "To hoary hairs, I will carry you"? I love to see the young man, willing to put on Christ, in the morning of his days—but how cheering to see the more advanced, and the grey headed, conducted into the path of submission in the evening of life, before the heavens open to receive the departing spirit. Your age is the very reason why you should be consistent—your grey hairs should be pledges of your propriety. You that are advanced—believing parents leave a good example behind you, for your surviving children—and let not your negligence mislead them, after you are removed from them—but let them have reason to refer to you as their ensamples in the things of God. So follow Christ, that after your departure, you may not be the scape-goat of their non-conformity.

A third time, I ask the question, have you been

baptized? Do you reply—I am not worthy—I am not good enough. Let me inform you, if you had a good opinion of yourself, it would prove you ineligible for the ordinances of Christ—but if you feel yourself a poor, lost, ruined, helpless sinner, and renouncing your own works, are simply looking to Jesus for salvation, and depending entirely upon his blood and righteousness—you are just the Individual, our Lord welcomes into his church. If you tarry, till you have less sins to confess, or till you have some excellency of your own to bring, you will never come at all. Come then believer in Christ, come to the ordinances he has enjoined; come and be bap- in water, in submission to him who was baptized in blood for thee—come, and put on Christ, before angels and men—before the world and the church—and instead of longer concealing thy colors, wear them openly and thankfully, deeming it your bounden duty, and your highest privilege to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. Now unto him that is able to keep you from fall- ing and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. To the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, AMEN.

THE END.

Gardiner & Son, Printers, Princes Street, Cavendish Square.

REVELATION

THE SOLE BASIS OF

CHURCH DISCIPLINE;

BY THE

REV. MORTLOCK DANIELL,

MINISTER AT BEULAH CHAPEL, RAMSGATE.

"IF ANY MAN SPEAK, LET HIM SPEAK AS THE ORACLES OF GOD."

LONDON:

T. GARDINER & SON, 20, PRINCES STREET,

CAVENDISH SQUARE.

M.DCCC.XXXVIII.

PREFACE.

The Mariner expects to make very slow progress, when he ploughs the mighty deep against wind and tide—and the Author of the ensuing pages, steering his little bark against the wind of prejudice and the tide of popularity, feels it impossible that he can obtain the haven of general acquiescence. Nevertheless there is an energy in Truth which sustains its Advocate, though he should be alone in the field, and which ensures an ultimate conquest, notwithstanding a season of comparative defeat.

And indeed were we to be silent on all occasions, when the "*vox populi*" would not befriend us, unquestionably the Dove of Truth, finding no place for the sole of her foot, must fly back to the *arcanum* of Heaven, carrying thither the melancholy tidings of an universal dissaffection for her plumage.

The Author considers it unnecessary to offer any apology, in entertaining and expressing sentiments, on the subject of Communion, foreign to the opinions and convictions of some of those who have been recognized as "Authorities" in our churches—inasmuch as others whose writings have been equally esteemed, and whose abilities have been in no respect inferior, coincide with his views.

Nothing however, can be more illiberal than the charge of Schism, which the late Rev. Robert Hall adduces against his opponents. It is no more applicable to them, as dissenting from open communion, than it was applicable to him, as dissenting from the Established Church. If a conscientious difference of opinion be schism, then every Christian is a schismatic.

And equally unworthy so able a pen, is the assertion, that if we refuse *un*baptized persons communion at the Lord's Table, to be consistent, we should refuse to *pray* with them, or to invite them to *preach* for us, or to unite with us in any spiritual exercise—This indeed *would* be schism. On the contrary, it is our duty and our privilege to co-operate with them as far as we can conscientiously, and as much our duty, though our grief, *to cease* to co-operate when conscience upbraids.

It is easy to affix an import to passages of Holy Scripture, which never was intended by their inspired Author,—and doubtlessly when our Saviour prayed "That they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee" (a quotation made by the late Mr. Hall, in the title page of his work) he intended not a unity of *sentiment* but a unity of *spirit*. He was not praying against *diversity*, but against *division;* and the chief design of his supplication was to secure an uninterrupted exhibition of *love* and *holiness*, among all his followers. And surely these may predominate, where difference of opinion prevails. A reciprocal affection should characterize the respective sections of the militant church; and he only is truly a Schismatic who pleads diversity of sentiment as an argument why he should not maintain the unity of the Spirit. We contend, unequivocally, that "one spirit" or "one heart and soul," *may* and *ought* to animate every Believer in Christ, notwithstanding an almost endless discrepancy in

their apprehensions of Truth. Let each carry out his own creed, but let him not cease to love his brethren.

We can easily imagine an Episcopalian, an Independent, and a Baptist, engaged in the same town, as ministers of the Gospel. Each preferring his own denomination, not from sectarian jealousy, but from a conviction that it is most consistent. We can further conceive that in many things they see eye to eye, and most comfortably and conscientiously combine their energies. They can pray together, visit the sick together, endeavour to moralize the town together, and speak of many fundamental doctrines with a pleasing degree of unanimity.

However, in some respects they differ considerably.—The Episcopalian vindicates the sprinkling of infants, and the consistency of God-fathers and God-mothers. The Independent justifies the sprinkling of infants, but censures the introduction of God-fathers and God-mothers. The Baptist censures both, and pleads only for the immersion of adult believers. The Episcopalian espouses parochial communion—the Independent, mixed-communion—the Baptist, strict-communion.

But we ask, Is this Schism? Are they enemies? May they not possess *one spirit of decision* against the world, and *one spirit of love* towards each other, notwithstanding these differences? May they not maintain, in their several churches their respective preferences, and yet live on terms of intimacy and Christian affection?

Communion *in spirit* should be as universal as Christianity, while communion *in sentiment* may be conscientiously limited, on some points, to our distinct denominations. And surely we may "love as brethren" and delight in each other's prosperity, while we claim the scriptural freedom to discipline the various sections of Christ's Church, over which we preside, according to our individual views of his revealed truth.

When learned men differ, let the topic be what it may, contumely can only degrade the party that evinces it; and if men of superlative talent and laboured research, have arrived at *opposite* conclusions, it follows, as a consequent, whether we concur with the one or the other, inferiority and disdain are effectually excluded. Diversity of sentiment needs not invective, though firmness and decision, for what we believe to be "The Truth," require an uncompromising Declaration.

Ramsgate, June, 1838.

ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS.

I. BAPTISM, AN IMPORTANT AND PERPETUAL ORDINANCE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

II. BAPTISM, A NECESSARY CONDITION OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP.

III. BAPTISM, AND THE LORD'S SUPPER, SCRIPTURALLY AND INDISSOLUBLY CONNECTED.

IV. MIXED COMMUNION, OR ITS VARIOUS PLEAS CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED.

V. MIXED COMMUNION, AND ITS INCONSISTENCIES DETECTED.

VI. ANIMADVERSIONS UPON SOME OF THE STATEMENTS OF THE LATE REV. ROBERT HALL.

VII. A FEW CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

REVELATION

THE SOLE BASIS OF

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

I. BAPTISM AN IMPORTANT AND PERPETUAL ORDINANCE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

It is admitted by Episcopalians, Independents, Baptists, and Methodists, that Baptism, howsoever administered, is a most important rite in the Church of Christ. And such a concession will suffice our present purpose, without touching upon the different views the several denominations entertain, either concerning its mode or its subjects. All agree it is an ordinance, clearly revealed in the New Testament, regarded by Christ and his Apostles, and for the total, or partial abrogation of which, there is no substantial authority. All agree it ought to be perpetuated in the militant church, until it is repealed by Him, who is the only Lawgiver in Zion. All agree it was confirmed by our Saviour after his resurrection, in those memorable words "Go ye forth and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsover I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The authenticity of this passage is admitted by all Christians, notwithstanding the disparity of their expositions—some enlarge, others diminish the import of the words, nevertheless the commission itself is disputed by none.

Since then Baptism is an ordinance, not of man, but of God; since the time of its administration is only bounded by the duration of the world, we enquire why should it be laid aside? Why should it be deemed a non-essential? Why should so striking a line of demarcation between the church and the world be effaced? By no means responds each denomination of Christians. It is important in the estimation of all.

Time may occasion many changes in human systems, and what might be prudent to pursue in one century, might be very impolitic to observe in the succeeding one—but the Institutions of Christ neither succumb to the device of man, nor to the expediency of the age. In their introduction and establishment, the great Head of the Church has preconceived all the consequences of their perpetuity, so that nothing can possibly transpire to render their observance inexpedient. And where carnal policy usurps a prerogative, which sterling piety never can concede, viz. to abolish or abridge Divine ordinations, as her blind imagination may contrive—just in proportion as she encroaches upon the sacred territory of Supremacy, in a similar proportion, the beauties and ornaments of Christianity become a prey to her sacrilege.

Suffice it to say, Baptism is an ordinance enjoined by Jesus Christ, to be observed by all his followers, till his second advent; and as in the due regard of every other, so in the observance of this institution, there is great reward. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." "This is the love of God that ye keep his commandments." "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?"

II. BAPTISM A NECESSARY CONDITION OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP.

That Baptism was considered a neccesary condition of church fellowship, in the days of the Apostles, and long after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is apparent from many portions of Holy Scripture. In the second Chapter of Acts, we find the connection between Baptism and Communion plainly maintained. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." It is also evident from the language of St. Paul in his first epistle to the church at Corinth, that its members were universally baptized, inasmuch as in censuring their carnal and illiberal preferences, he interrogates, "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" In which interrogation, there could have been neither emphasis nor propriety, upon the supposition that many of them had not been baptized at all.

That the Church of England also entertains such an opinion, is apparent from her twenty-seventh Article, wherein she says, "Baptism is a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism, rightly, are grafted into the church." And indeed the great champion for *mixed* communion, the late Rev. Robert Hall, implies the accuracy of our present assertion when he declares, "The apostles, it is acknowledged, admitted none to the Lord's supper but such as were previously baptized." "Their instructions were too plain to be mistaken, their authority too sacred to be contemned by a professor of Christianity, without being guilty of daring impiety. To have received into

the church men who disputed their inspiration, and despised their injunctions, would have been to betray their trust, and to renounce their pretensions as the living depositaries of the mind of Christ: to have admitted those who believing their inspiration, yet refused a compliance with their orders, would have let into the church the most unheard of licentiousness, and polluted it, by incorporating with its members the worst of men. Neither of these could be thought of, and no other alternative remained, but to *insist as a test of sincerity* on a *punctual* compliance, with what was known and acknowledged as the apostolical doctrine." Obviously, therefore, whether we consult the inspired oracles, or the popular establishment, or the opinion of the *opponents* of strict-communion, all concur in our affirmation, *That Baptism was a necessary condition of church fellowship in the days of the Apostles.*

And this being fully conceded, we consider it no longer problematical whether the mixed-communionist, or the strict-communionist occupies the vantage ground; for while the latter dispenses with no conditions with which the apostles would not dispense, the former employs a discretionary prerogative, as regards the very conditions the apostles enforced, and ventures to sacrifice them at the shrine of expediency. If the Apostles, according to the admission of the late Mr. Hall, admitted *none* to the Lord's supper, but such as were previously baptized,—and the late Mr. Hall, admitted *many* to the Lord's supper who were *not* previously baptized—unquestionably the discipline of the apostles, and that of the late Mr. Hall, were at variance! We shall presently consider the various arguments that have been introduced, with a view to sanction the abrogation of apostolical conditions—never-

theless we consider it far more satisfactory to be able to adduce the authority and example of inspired apostles as the basis of our procedure, than the conjectures and opinions of *un*inspired men, however spiritual, learned, or popular. And if the conditions of church fellowship, revealed in the New Testament, may be superseded, augmented, or diminished, as human device, or christian sincerity may prescribe, how is the Bible any longer "the religion of Protestants," or how are the "Holy scriptures sufficient both for faith and practice?" Since then it is admitted that the communion of saints at the Lord's table in the days of the apostles, was a communion restricted to persons previously baptized, it is fairly inferred that "Baptism is a necessary condition to church fellowship"—inasmuch as no *inspired* authority has subsequently determined otherwise.

III. BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER SCRIPTURALLY AND INDISSOLUBLY CONNECTED.

The late Mr. Hall, in pleading for the admission of *un*baptized persons to the Lord's Table has affirmed, that there is no connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that to all appearance the rites in question rest upon independent grounds. How this accords with his former assertion "that the apostles admitted none to the Lord's Supper but such as were previously baptized," we must leave our readers to decide!! It appears to us, the two statements are quite at variance with each other, for to admit that the apostles insisted upon the connection, and then to deny that such a connection ever existed is far from consistency.

All the ordinances of Christ may be considered as links

in one concatenated chain ; to be separated neither by prejudice nor expediency, but to be enforced in their primitive harmony, and introduced in their legitimate position to the end of the world. They who contend there is no positive mandate for the connection between the ordinance of Baptism, and the Lord's supper, may as reasonably maintain, there is no specific command for the connection between Baptism and Prayer; but because we cannot find an express passage of Scripture, publishing in so many words, that Christian ordinances are connected, are we at liberty to divide them from each other ? Why are they revealed ? Why were they instituted ? The fact of their institution by the same Saviour, and of their uniform regard by the apostles, implies their union and harmony. The analogy of Scripture is most decidedly against their separation.

Whatever Christ has commanded, it is the duty of all Christians to regard, whether they can prove any connection between his injunctions or not : so that upon the supposition, that we could discern no connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, yet, viewing them both as the institutions of Christ, both would have an equal claim upon our observance, and the non-observance of either would leave us only *partially* submissive, instead of *uniformly* obedient.

Baptism is an open expression of our separation from the world, and of our desire to take up the cross of Christ, an outward and visible demonstration of our faith and repentance. And, surely, such an institution seems necessary as a test of decision and sincerity, on the part of those who having lived in the pleasures of sin, and the vanities of a wicked world, are, by the grace of God, desirous henceforth to have communion with his people, and to

participate in the privileges of his militant church. Surely there should be some public recognition, some signal rite, to celebrate the dethronement of Satan, and the conversion of a sinner.

The great Head of the Church, therefore, instituted this ordinance, which when duly administered, beautifully signifies the candidate's fellowship with Jesus in his death and resurrection. By this he practically avows he is dead to the world, and risen with Christ to bring forth fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. And having thus before angels and men, before the church and the world witnessed a good confession, even apostolical authority and precedent bid him welcome to all the blessings and benefits of church fellowship. Surely the spiritual birth of the sons of God is an occurrence deserving an early development through a scriptural ceremony, and a change so momentous should be advertised by the personal obedience of its subject. And if baptism followed regeneration, or conversion to God, as quickly *now*, as it did in the days of the apostles, how much more impressive and ostensible would the coming of the kingdom of Christ appear! How separate would be the church and the world, and how the fidelity of modern converts, the decision of newly formed disciples, would invigorate and enliven the energies of the ministers of the cross! The fruit of their labor would be more plentifully discovered, and, instead of having oftentimes to conjecture whether such an one were seriously disposed, their practical love and obedience to Christ, would attest the interesting fact, and dispel the anxiety of past solicitude.

Primitive discipline being duly considered, and no subsequent communication having been received from any inspired source, to authorize an alteration, abridgement, or

division in it, we deem that individual by no means imitable who ventures to invade it. His motive may be good, and praiseworthy in the estimation of men, but a good motive is no solid plea for the violation of good and *inspired* discipline. Jesus Christ is responsible for the consequences of his own institutions, as long as we regard them scripturally and harmoniously, but so soon as we assume any discretionary power, or adopt any mutilating system, all the responsibility of such variations must lie at the door of those who introduce them. Jesus Christ, therefore, or his apostles, as his inspired representatives, having according to the words of the mixed-communionist, admitted none to the Lord's Table, but such as were previously baptized, they have thereby established a connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which modern opinion may discountenance, but which it is the bounden duty of every Christian to retain, until no less an authority than that which introduced and sanctioned the union shall appear to dissolve it.

And here we may remark, what appears to us, another irreconcilable feature in the statements of the late Mr. Hall. After avowing his opinion that there is no necessary connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, he observes that any candidate for communion, who is convinced of the propriety of believer's baptism, and yet "hesitates or refuses, alleging that it is not essential to salvation, that it is a mere external rite, and that some of the holiest of men have died in the neglect of it, is *disqualified* for Christian communion!" But we appeal to the living, if there be not a most manifest incongruity in these representations? If there be no connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, then why is any pious individual *disqualified* for Christian communion

on account of his neglect of Baptism? Yet even the late Mr. Hall, proscribes from the Lord's Supper, all who convinced of believer's baptism wilfully neglect it; and hereby, as a consequent, infers, there is some connection between them!

Leaving however these discrepancies we deem it but reasonable to call upon all the ministers of mixed-communion Churches, to follow the counsel of their Champion and favorite, and to refuse the Lord's Supper, to all, who believing adult baptism to be scriptural are nevertheless *un*baptized. "We," says their Author "have no hesitation in affirming that the individuals in question are disqualified for Christian communion." Thus having affirmed there is no connection between the two ordinances, that the two rites stand upon independent grounds, he afterwards so connects them, as to disqualify for the Lord's Supper all who convinced of Baptism live in the neglect of it! If there be no connection between two divine institutions, how can the wilful disregard of one disqualify a person for the observance of the other?

Hence it is apparent the most learned leader may miss his way, yet it must be pleasing to the strict-communionist to know, that the great advocate for *mixed*-communion, was himself too *strict* to allow every christian to commune—proscribing all who, being Baptists in theory, were not so in practice! And if the pastors of mixed communion churches did the same, forthwith, would they not forbid many they now admit to the privilege of communion? We would not uncharitably suppose that all who commune with Baptists, as unbaptized persons, are convinced of the necessity, or rather of the sole propriety of believer's baptism, they neglect; nevertheless we are sure that many of them are, indeed many openly confess they

discern the scriptural character of the rite, but do not consider it essential—and these are they whom even the late Mr. Hall, would have proscribed! But the ancient landmark once removed, every Jubilee removes it farther—every century swells the stream of charity, falsely so called, and these wilfully disobedient are suffered in their disobedience!

They choose one ordinance, and refuse another, and Ministers sanction them in their mutilations, by allowing them to exercise this discretionary power. They see, but they follow not their convictions. They believe, but they do not obey the dictate of their faith. They profess, but they do not perform. They know the will of their Lord, but do it not; yet even these are welcome in many of our churches and received as eligible communicants! Is this either primitive or proper?

The Episcopalian, *consistent with his principles*, and believing baptism to be an important ordinance in the church of Christ, insists upon it as a pre-requisite to communion. The Independent also, *consistent with his principles*, requires it to be regarded by all who partake of the Lord's Supper.* The strict-communion Baptist also, *consistent with his principles*, firmly believing that baptism is a condition of admission into the church of Christ, scripturally requires it of all who seek fellowship in her privileges—and in thus acting he is justified, even by the late Mr. Hall, who said: "Let it be admitted that

* We have heard of one or two Independent Ministers, who have expressed their willingness to admit, as communicants, those who have neither been sprinkled nor baptized—but we are sure this is not the general impression of the independent body, and therefore these exceptions do not invalidate our observations.

baptism is under all circumstances a necessary condition of church fellowship, and it is impossible for the Baptists to act otherwise." "It is the infallible consequence of the opinion they entertain." But the mixed-communion Baptist (in theory a Baptist, in discipline an Independent) though he believes *both* ordinances to be of perpetual obligation, allows many of his communicants to disregard *one* of them—though he admits "the Apostles, admitted none to the Lord's Supper, but such as were previously baptized," thinks he may consistently do otherwise—though the fact of his ministerial office, implies he his to govern the church under Christ, and to enforce what he considers to be the will of Christ, nevertheless allows his own impressions and convictions, to succumb to those of others.

We contend not for the infallibility of any Minister neither would we suffer him to assume an unscriptural despotism, that would characterize him rather as a lord over God's heritage, than the servant of his flock. He is however, deeply responsible for the maintenance of primitive and scriptural discipline, in the section of the church of which he has the oversight, and if he allows the invasion of what he believes to be the inspired rule, or to have been the apostolical order, it appears to us that no plea can really justify his course.

We would ask the Minister who favors the system of mixed-communion, why he is so precise as to *the form*, in which the ordinance should be administered and, at the same time, provides for those whom he believes neglect the ordinance altogether? Why he contends so strenuously for *the mode*, and yet in many of his communicants allows the absolute neglect of the Institution? Surely if the mode of the ordinance be important, the ordinance itself must be more so, yet though

he will not give up *the mode*, as a Baptist, he will give up the *ordinance itself* as a non-essential to the privileges of communion at the Lord's Table! He will not become an Independent, and give up the mode of the ordinance, yet he will become a mixed-communionist, and give up the ordinance itself! Is not this straining out the gnat, and swallowing the camel! He may answer he enforces the ordinance in the pulpit—but if he do not enforce it in the discipline of his church, he *practically* abandons what he *verbally* espouses. Every other ordinance and precept which he advocates in the pulpit, he requires to be maintained in the church. If he advocate the Lord's Supper he requires his church to exhibit it—or if he commend Temperance, Meekness, Prayer, or Self-denial, he requires his church, or his communicants to observe them. Then why is baptism to be the exception? Why preach it in the pulpit, if it may be omitted in the pew? Why say, it is important, and act as though it were not?

The plan of the Independent churches is to admit believers to the Lord's Supper, allowing them either to be sprinkled or immersed—both they consider baptism—and if the same plan prevail in our Baptist churches, why do we uselessly multiply denominations and sects? What distinction is there between the discipline of an Independent church, and that of a Baptist mixed-communion church upon the broadest principles? Both have *deacons* baptized and un-baptized—both have *members* baptized and un-baptized—both accommodate the *mode* of baptism to individual preference—and therefore we ask where is the distinction between them? The only difference consists in the name Baptist and Independent,

and in the private opinion and conviction of the minister! Startling thought, that whether we are Baptist or Independent ministers, the discipline of our churches is to be the same, and that the only discrepancy is to be merged in the personal preference of the officiating pastor! Why not bury in oblivion the names "Baptist" and "Independent," and unite both denominations under the significant title, "Mixed Communionist?

Thus it is observable, the Independent is more particular about the ordinance of Baptism, than the *mixed* communion Baptist; inasmuch as the former requires its administration to every communicant, whereas the latter allows what he considers baptism, to be omitted in innumerable instances—and thus, although a Baptist, he pours colder streams of apathy upon the institution either than the Episcopalian or the Independent, as he only *regards* baptism, or altogether *omits* it, according to the inclination, prejudice, and opinion of his respective communicants.

But we would ask, are communicants to propose the terms upon which they are to commune? Are they to obey, or disobey what evangelical precepts they may choose? Are they to dislocate the symmetry of Christian obedience, and take up what fragments they may be able to carry, without the reproach of the cross? We answer, No; let them take Christ's ordinances as they must take Christ himself—Altogether—Christ is not divided. In no public body or society does any individual, desirous of becoming one of its members decide the terms upon which he shall have admission; it is expected as he is wishful of the connection he will conform to certain regulations. Why therefore should a person anxious to be a member or a communicant,

of any particular church, elect, as regards baptism, his own conditions of entrance? Is it not reasonable and scriptural that the minister of that church should point him to the discipline observed, and the ordinances connected, by the apostles, and require of him an unreserved conformity to every rite instituted by Christ, and honored and established by the example of the primitives?

Till it can be proved that the apostles separated the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which they did not, as acknowledged by the late Mr. Hall, we shall feel ourselves bound to maintain there is a special and scriptural connection between them—and, as every connection which rests upon apostolical precept and precedent demands our cordial approbation and maintenance, this must not be deemed an exception.

IV. MIXED COMMUNION OR ITS VARIOUS PLEAS CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED.

1. *Charity, no substantial plea for mixed communion.*

Charity notwithstanding her extensive and pungent sympathies, knows some territory which she could not consistently moisten with her tears, or include in her prayers. Charity must be regulated by the Bible, or it is charity "falsely so called." Charity must be bounded by consistency. Unbounded benevolence (we mean mere reason acting upon this principle) has made many an Infidel. How many have presumed there were no *everlasting* punishment—no place of perdition—no devil —no final judgement—pleading the charity and benevolence of the Deity, as a confirmation of their sceptical decisions! Wresting revelation, and maintaining the fiction

of an universal elysium, because God is merciful and benevolent. Even charity must be brought into subjection to the obedience of Christ. Charity is not to exalt herself against the Christ of God, or his institutions. We would enquire, Is the authority of Christ or the charity of the Christian to legislate? Or has christian charity any discretionary power over the commands Christ has dispensed? Is charity to revise them, or to strike out such parts as may seem objectionable to her sympathies? Will our conduct be consistent in destroying the connection the practice of the apostles maintained, between the institutions of Christ, because we do so, to display charity to our fellow Christians? Are we to rob God, to be generous to man; or to infringe upon Divine harmony in order to display human sympathy? Unquestionably not.

It has been frequently urged, as the unbaptized believer will commune with us in Heaven, ought we not to have sufficient charity to permit him to do so on earth? Let those who urge this remember, we know very little of Heaven, and even the little we do know, is not revealed, to be the basis of our present actions, but the object of our future hopes. What the discipline of the church triumphant *will be*, and what the discipline of the church militant *ought to be* are materially distinct. The confusion of two states so dissimilar, must be pronounced inadmissible and incoherent both by the laws of the logician, and the doctrine of the New Testament. We are not to regulate our procedure here, by our confused views of the future, but by the word, testimony, and example of Jesus Christ.

Moreover we think there is much in Holy Scripture to authorize the supposition, that they who have served

Christ the most fully and faithfully on earth, will hereafter enjoy the most signal promotions—not as though their obedience deserved such promotion, but on account of the special blessing and reward promised to it.* And if it be the fact, that in a future world, these distinctions are to be enjoyed, by those who have been most faithful and consistent, while here, what impropriety or what deficiency of charity can there be, in the obedient disciple reaping even in this world, privileges to which the *dis*obedient has no claim ? As we sow, we may expect to reap, and he who sows the seed of obedience most plentifully, may hope to reap the fruit of felicity most copiously. Be this as it may, all with whom we shall commune in heaven will be subject to Jesus Christ in all things, and uniformly consistent, and therefore we should not make provision for their inconsistency here. We shall do many things in heaven, we should not be justified in doing on earth ; and we are exhorted to the performance of many things here, which a future state will supersede; therefore it is inconclusive to reason from one state to the other, as though what will not be done in heaven ought not to be done on earth. The Divine Being himself varies his discipline between a *perfect* and an *imperfect* system of things—in the former he shews no rod of correction, in the latter he cannot lay it aside.

The late Mr. Hall, complains of the want of charity in the conduct of the strict-communionist, in the exclusion of "any part of the flock of Christ, any portion of his mystical body, and of that church which he has bought with his blood." But notwithstanding he prefers this charge

* Luke 19, Chap. 17 verse.

against us, we are prepared to bring the same charge against the system he defended, and to say in the words of St. Paul, "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou that judgest doest the same thing." Are not those who admit the propriety of adult baptism and yet neglect it, as a non-essential, a part of the flock of Christ? Are not those who see the ordinance and obey it not, a portion of his mystical body? Can we un-Christianize them because they follow not what they discern as regards this rite? All parties admit they are good people, though they are not baptized. These then, though a part of the flock of Christ, a portion of his mystical body, the late Mr. Hall refused, and tells us they are disqualified for Christian communion! Thereby pursuing himself, as a *mixed*-communionist, what he severely condemns in the *strict*-communionist.

Charity frequently imposes on its subjects; or it lays them open to the impulse of *feeling*, rather than the voice of *judgment*. The charity the gospel inculcates is one that "rejoices in the truth," defends the bulwarks of Zion, and refuses to caress the disobedient child. At the great day of account, will the present plea of the mixed-communionst before his fellow-man, be a sufficient plea before the Lord his Judge? Will it indemnify him, because he urges his charity to his fellow christian, as an excusation for the alteration he has made in Christ's ordinances, or for the unscriptural amalgamation he has permitted in that section of the Church, of which he had the oversight?

Besides, if Charity allow the neglect of the rite of Baptism prior to communion in *one* instance, it may allow that neglect *universally*. If one, claiming the Minister's

charity, may omit that ceremony, surely all have an equal interest in that charity, and consequently such a functionary, to be impartial, must announce from his pulpit or elsewhere, that although he believes Baptism to be an ordinance of Christ, and an ordinance regarded by the primitives, prior to their communion at the Lord's Table, nevertheless, instead of disciplining his hearers by his *judgment*, he shall substitute his *charity*, and shall consequently receive them, as communicants, upon their own terms, provided he is satisfied they are the children of God. We like not this free-will in *discipline* any more than we admire free-will in *doctrine*; for while the latter makes man partly his own Saviour, the former makes him partly his own Leader. The judgement of a father is not to be overpowered by his affection for his children, lest confusion and disobedience should invade his circle. The judgement of a trader is not to succumb to his private inclinations, lest the tide of order and prosperity should cease to flow. Neither is the judgement of an ambassador of Christ to be dissipated by his charity. And the sooner every Baptist minister follows out his own convictions of the importance of the ordinance of baptism, as zealously as the Episcopalian and the Independent exemplify theirs, the sooner will primitive harmony be restored, and obedience to Christ will characterize every communicant, while he partakes of the emblems of his Saviour's dying love.

We have already observed that Christian charity must be bounded by consistency—for if Christian charity be allowed to fly where she pleases on the wings of imagination, and could carry with her an unrestrained supremacy, what would be the sequel of her flight? Would not Christian charity, overturn the very projects

and purposes of the Deity? She would annihilate hell, and carry salvation to the prisoners it contains. This brief observation, duly considered, will convince us that Christian charity must be circumscribed by revelation—that she must not wander where she pleases—that she must sit at the feet of Jesus to learn his laws, and when she rises, must rise not to divide them, but to enforce their connected observance. Charity, therefore, though it be a powerful argument, on the one hand, why we should bear each other's burdens, why we should comfort and cheer each other on pilgrimage, carries with it, on the other hand, no prerogative to depart from the institutions of Christ, or to deviate from apostolical example and precedent. It is only a *mistaken* Charity that tramples on the harmonies of Scripture, for *true* Charity will cleave to the cross, and be crucified rather than leave it.

2. *Conscience or Sincerity no plea for mixed Communion.*

Conscience being subject to early prejudices, evil biasses, and injurious impressions, is one of the most fickle foundations upon which ecclesiastical discipline can be established. And indeed some have had such Protean consciences that in the space of ten years they have been *conscientiously Dissenters; conscientiously Episcopalians;* and *conscientiously Irvingites.* Not that we impute to them any fraudulent motive in their fickleness, but their conduct testifies they are not fully persuaded in their own minds, that they are unstable in their ways, and that it must, therefore, be exceedingly unsafe to leave the sure oracles of God, for the convictions of individual consciences. What! shall we leave church discipline and Christian ordinances at the mercy of

consciences? Is conscience to be lawgiver in Zion? Are there no settled laws in the kingdom of Christ, that they must be varied and modelled according to divers consciences? We confess, we covet not "The unity of the Church" if it be only obtained by allowing every man's conscience to legislate; nor do we admire that benevolence that provides for known inconsistencies. We can only welcome "the unity of the Church," as it is founded in each individual member's conformity and subjection to Christ.

Further, If conscience be the basis of their proceedure, who plead for mixed-communion, why is the conscience of the Quaker, who considers water-baptism quite superseded, to be less consulted than the conscience of the Pædo-Baptist, who deems it sufficient to have been sprinkled in infancy? If conscience is to decide the terms upon which Christian fellowship is to be permitted, surely the consciences of all good people ought to be *equally* considered, and instead of being "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgement," the result will be, a body of Christians neither keeping the unity of the spirit nor the bond of peace. It may be observed the Apostle intended the church "to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgement," *only in relation to essentials.* Admitting this we enquire what individual calling himself a Baptist, can be so inconsistent, or such *a traitor to his own denomination,* as to class the very ordinance that characterizes his sect, among the *non-essentials?* Why is he a Baptist, if the ordinance of Baptism be a non-essential?

We remember the Church of Galatia introduced, in their day, a mixed communion, under the pretext of denominational charity, and with a view to be generous

to those who differed from them, and to avoid some oppressions and peculiarities attaching to Christianity. But did the apostle allow them to mitigate their folly by pleading they had studied other men's consciences?

Was it sufficient for him to know they had sought to win over some by the re-introduction of circumcision? Could he be silenced by such frivolous excuses, or did he befriend such mistaken notions? On the contrary, he charges them with falling from grace—falling away from their former steadfastness—with ceasing to run well—and with taking to themselves an unauthorized power, not to be vindicated upon any principle whatever. No doubt many thought him uncharitable and severe in his decisions, yet, perceiving the ultimate tendency of innovation to be total inconsistency, he welcomed the censure connected with his zeal and promptitude in rebuking them.

Do we occupy unscriptural premises when we say, Ministers are to act in the church of Christ according to their personal convictions of the bearing of the word of God, and not according to the opinion the consciences of their hearers may furnish? Either they believe baptism to be an ordinance required of every Believer, or not. If they believe it, they must also have distinct views as to the *mode* and *subject*, nor are those views to give place to the views of those who think otherwise—After all, either the judgement of the Minister must give place to the feeling of the candidate, or the feeling of the candidate must give place to the judgement of the Minister. The Minister must either regulate his discipline by the conscience of the communicant, or the communicant must conform to the discipline of the Minister. The former is as unreasonable, and as unscriptural, as the latter is reasonable and orthodox. Ministers are to teach as they are

taught of God, not as they are taught of men. And if any individual profit by a certain Minister, and has confidence in his ability to explain the bearings of truth, and the ordinances of the gospel, certainly such an one seeking to *commune* should be willing to *conform*.

Can any Christian, wishing for communion at the Lord's Table, scripturally claim the prerogative of stating on what terms he shall be introduced to such communion? Or that he will commune, having been baptized in his own way, although the Minister considers *his* way no baptism at all? Surely this is the disciple above his master, or the flock fixing their own fold, contrary to the Shepherd's conviction. It appears preposterous to accommodate the discipline of any church to the discordant views of the respective members. The acts of the apostles must guide us, and if there be any discrepancy of opinion, as to the *interpretation* of their acts, the decision scripturally rests with the presiding Minister, rather than his people. If a Minister possess a judgement, which he believes to have been formed by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, that judgement is not simply for private instruction but also for public direction. This is the standard by which he must examine what he allows, and therefore whatever he allows contrary thereto, be it from a pure or an impure motive, he is culpable in the non-exercise of a judgement given him especially as a servant of Christ for public manifestation.

Ministers are as much stewards of the *ordinances* of Christ, as they are of the *doctrines* of Christ, and it is required of a steward that he be found faithful. It may be said, ordinances are not so important as doctrines, and therefore need not be enforced with so much precision; but such reasoning is irrelevant; for the faithfulness of a

Steward is a *sine qua non*, without reference to the importance of the things committed to his charge. Whether we entrust a servant with a *penny* or a *guinea*, for any specific purpose, fidelity is equally his duty in either case; and whether we, as Ministers of the cross, be the stewards of *doctrines*, or *ordinances*, however great the disproportion of the two, in relation to eternity, yet both being the property of Christ, and deposited with us for an express object, our character and capacity demand their true appropriation.

Passing the plea of conscience for that of Sincerity; we observe, Sincerity also is a treacherous foundation on which to build, as a man may be sincerely *wrong*, as well as sincerely *right*. Saul of Tarsus was *sincerely* wrong when a blasphemer, a persecutor and injurious; the patron of abrogated ceremonies and the zealot of Judaism—He does not however adduce the sincerity of his motives, as any excusation of his wickedness, or as any redeeming clause in his indictment.

Further, if the coin of Sincerity be the price of admission into church fellowship, that coin should be received from every hand that brings it; for when a coin is once pronounced sterling, it is universally current. Suppose then a Socinian to request the Lord's Supper at the hands of a mixed-communionist, who pleads that as the church militant is by no means perfect, he must not expect all her members to think as he thinks, and must therefore fix the *sincerity* of each as the standard of their fellowship. Notwithstanding this, he refuses the Socinian. The Socinian reminds him that he has said, "Sincerity is the standard of fellowship" and then shewing him the said coin, or protesting that he is truly sincere in his socinianism, urges to commune. Still he is re-

fused, and is told *his* coin of Sincerity will not pass. He enquires, Why not? He is told because, though sincere, he invalidates Divine revelation. Again he replies, he was informed that Divine revelation was not the standard of fellowship, but *sincere views* of that Divine revelation. So that at length the mixed-communionist is driven by the Socinian, from his plea of Sincerity, and is obliged to cast anchor in the bosom of inspired Revelation. Revelation therefore is the weapon with which he conquers the Socinian—and when parting with this, he takes up Sincerity as a substitute, then by the Socinian he is ultimately vanquished. With the sword of the Spirit he prevails, but with the sword of Sincerity, he is prevailed against.

The New Testament, apostolical precedent, and primitive example are the inflexible and infrangible triad with which the church is to defend herself from errors in doctrine and in discipline. Testing *creed* and *conduct* by these infallible arbiters, she is to pronounce her censure upon every deviation, and to regard it inadmissible and dangerous; whether the apology for such departure be a mistaken charity, a well-intending conscience, or a misleading sincerity. Every plea for the infraction of a course, tenaciously pursued by the inspired Apostles, must be inconsistent; and therefore as the late Mr. Hall, observes that "the apostles admitted none to the Lord's Supper, but those who were previously baptized," it would be inconsistent, on our part, to extend such an ordinance, by administering it to those who may be unbaptized, however *sincere* and *conscientious* in their misconceptions.

3. *Baptism not essential—no plea for mixed communion.*

It has been observed by many, that as they can go to heaven without being baptized, it cannot be so very essential as some have thought, and ought therefore only to be administered when desired, and by no means introduced as the door to church fellowship. To which we reply—Baptism is as essential to obedience, as Faith is to Salvation ; and as Salvation and obedience are ever connected in the New Testament, we have no scriptural rule by which to infer the non-importance of the latter. It is the very essence of Antinomianism to separate *faith* and *works*, *creed* and *conduct*, *salvation* and *obedience*. Therefore let those who speak of Christian ordinances as non-essentials, bear in recollection, they cast a slight upon the preceptive will of Christ.

If Salvation be important, obedience must be—as it is the road that leads to it, though not the price that purchases it. If Faith be important, works must be—as they are the evidences of its preciousness. If creed be important, conduct must be—as it is the mirror through which it exhibits its beauty.

If Baptism be a non-essential, why did Jesus institute it? Why did he administer it? Why was he baptized in Jordan? Why did he refer to it just before his ascension in his commission to his disciples? The fact of his having connected it so closely with the preaching of the Gospel, in his final charge, has stamped an importance and a permanency upon it, never to be overlooked while the Bible remains. And he, who in the face of our Lord's authority, ventures to denounce it, as a non-essential, appears to us the very last individual to be admitted into church fellowship.

If it be a non-essential, why is it particularly mentioned, as having been observed by the Apostle Paul, almost continuous with his conversion? Why does he imply its universal administration in the churches at Corinth and Galatia? Or why did the Apostles in every case, connect it with church fellowship, as the late Rev. Robert Hall acknowledges was their undeviating practice? Certainly if after the emphasis which is laid upon the ordinance of Baptism, it may be omitted as a non-essential--then the ordinance of the *Lord's Supper* may, with far greater propriety, as it occupies far less space both in the Gospels and Epistles.

And thus by commencing to remove one stone from the perfectly proportioned temple of Divine Institutions, we should invite others to lay unhallowed hands upon its holy symmetry, until, at length, having been divided by various prejudices, and polluted by unauthorized sacrifices, it would present the heart-rending spectacle of an irreparable and useless wreck.

Once more, let us enquire who pronounces Baptism a non-essential---a rite that may be dispensed with—or performed either according to the light of revelation, or the darkness of superstition? Is it an Episcopalian? No, He is consistent with his principles. Is it an Independent? No, He is consistent with his principles. Is it a Methodist? No, He is consistent with his principles. Is it a strict communion Baptist? No, He is consistent with his principles. Surely then it is only a Quaker, who deems it to have been superseded by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. No, He is consistent with his principles.

Whose voice then do we hear proclaiming that Baptism, as to its mode and subjects, must be left to the

discrepancy of Christian minds? Or that it has no connection with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper? It is a Baptist! What! *a Baptist* not maintain the indispensableness of the very ordinance that marks his denomination! a *Baptist* leaving Baptism at the sepulchres of the Apostles, and contending that as we are not inspired men, we must deviate from their uniform plan, as circumstances may dictate! a *Baptist* sacrificing Baptism upon the altar of Charity! a *Baptist* willing that Baptism should subserve to Conscience! Yes—a Baptist—*a mixed communion Baptist.*

O tempora! O mores! Thus we part with Christian decision, or with what the late Mr. Hall terms "the test of sincerity which the Apostles required." Instead of retaining obedience entire, we divide it into many fractional parts, and thereby sap its energy. May the great Head of the Church preserve us from sinfully immolating his connected and instructive ordinances on the altar of denominational charity. The altar may have a comely and an elegant appearance, but the sacrifice will smoke to the shame of its mistaken priest.

The Baptist considers infant sprinkling to be a relict of Popery—a fragment of Romish superstition—and he may maintain such an opinion, according to the exhortation of St. Paul, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"—without either inwardly feeling, or outwardly manifesting, an apathy or contumely towards his brethren, who think otherwise. Yet if such be his conscientious conviction, his deliberate conclusion; and if on this account he acknowledges himself a Baptist in preference to an Independent—to be consistent with himself, he cannot deem either the *mode* or the *subject* of Baptism a non-essential—and if he deem it an *essential*,

he must insist upon its scriptural and uniform observance in that section of communicants over which he presides;—not as the dispenser, but as the maintainer of ordinances dispensed by Christ.

With him the question simply is "Christianity" or "Popery". "Baptism" or "Romanism," and therefore it is palpably inconsistent to suppose that two such opposites can be connected, in a Church disciplined by scriptural precedent.

Thus, upon examination, it appears, we must, as Baptists, either maintain strict communion in our churches, or tolerate the introduction of what we consider a fragment of Romanism! It may be replied, that the *un*-baptized communicants do not believe it to be a fragment of Romanism; but we have already shewn that the *creed* of the communicant is not the standard of communion, but that the minister is responsible for the preservation of Christ's ordinances in, what he deems, their original purity; and, therefore, unquestionably he possesses authority to refuse the introduction of every system at variance therewith.

If then strict communion is the only basis upon which the Baptist can exclude, in his view, a relict of Popery, surely it is his duty to maintain such a discipline; and since every denomination of Christians has the right of *thinking for itself*, universally conceded, and the privilege of *acting for itself*, upon the conclusions at which it arrives, the Baptist minister is no more required to part with the leading features of his denomination, to exhibit his charity, than the Independent, or the Episcopalian, to demonstrate theirs. We have as much right to demand the Episcopalian and Independent to part with infant sprinkling, as they have to desire us to

give up adult Baptism. Our conscience ought to be as dear to us, and our judgement, as practical, as their conscience and judgement are sacred to them. And if charity require us to part with what they conscientiously term a *non-essential*, surely Charity requires them to part with what we conscientiously term a *popish superstition*.

Obviously therefore mixed-communion is an encroachment upon our Baptist churches, because it involves the exercise of a charity on our part, which they (the Independents) refuse to exhibit on their's. They will not conceal the ordinances of Christ, and confess their mode of Baptism, a non-essential, to be charitable to us, and therefore they ought not to require us to do so towards them.

Indeed as Baptists, we should be even more consistent in the admission of a Quaker, than a Pædo-Baptist to our communion, because the former only neglects an institution we greatly venerate, whilst the latter changes it away for an innovation, we consider, borrowed from the Church of Rome. With the Quaker in communion, we could only term him negligent of an ordinance—but with the Pædo-baptist in communion, we must acknowledge, we admit one who justifies and pursues a superstitious ceremony, taking the place of the scriptural rite that characterizing us as Baptists, and which if universally approved would issue in the ultimate extinction of our denomination. To love them as Brethren is one thing, but to allow that love to overpower a judgment for which we are accountable to God is another thing. To set aside Christian ordinances as non-essential, with a view most fully to manifest christian charity, is as unscriptural, as it would be to set aside christian charity, while we maintain the purity of christian ordinances.

If we act as the trustees of a friend, we must not

convey the property to a brother, because we love him. Nor must we change it away for any other species of property. So if Ministers be the trustees of Christ, (and the Apostle speaks of being put in trust with the Gospel) their important office neither empowers them to convey or to change the serious deposit, but to retain it faithfully until the coming of their Lord. "Not as pleasing men, but as God who trieth our hearts."

Thus Baptism, as an ordinance of Christ, as one which the Apostles never omitted prior to communion, as one which was enforced by our divine Redeemer in his latest breath prior to his ascension, cannot be discarded, or transmuted as a non-essential, but on the contrary should occupy the identical position in the discipline of our churches now, as it did in the days of the Apostles. The inspired men are not with us, it is true, but their inspired instructions and precedents are with us—and from these we must not deviate under any uninspired pretext whatever.

V. MIXED COMMUNION, AND ITS INCONSISTENCIES DETECTED.

The mixed-communionists departing from the apostolical precedent, and pleading brotherly charity as the ground of their deviation, are divided among themselves how far that charity should extend. Some extend it so far as to acknowledge the unbaptized communicants, *members of their churches* in common with the baptized,—and others, not willing to display it quite so unreservedly, only allow them to commune at the Lord's Table, and *not* to be considered as members in full fellowship. Let us firstly consider the inconsistency of the *most* charitable.

The Church is denominated a Baptist Church—although, perhaps, half its members are *un*baptized, and

opposed to adult baptism! Is this more consistent, than it would be, to describe a regiment composed in equal proportions, of English and Irish, a regiment of Englishmen? A denomination is represented by its title, and yet a baptist church may be a church, half of whose members have never been baptized at all! Is this consistency? Why call it a Baptist church, if Baptism be a non-essential, or an ordinance which the Minister allows the church to dispense with, or at least as many members as desire its omission?

The minister is denominated a Baptist, who, while he wishes to love all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, in sincerity, must avow his conviction that infant sprinkling is a vestige of Romanism—that it is fatal to the spread of his denomination—that it blends the world with the church—that *adult* baptism is an ordinance which the Apostles required as a previous step to communion—and that entirely on account of that particular rite, he secedes from others, and declares himself a Baptist.

Notwithstanding he suffers the *un*baptized, the patrons of infant sprinkling, to sustain the office of Deacon!—Men looked upon as examples; men of considerable influence; who by their neglect of ordinances, will, most probably, be the occasion of their non-observance by many others, who will readily excuse themselves from baptism, because the officers in the church are not baptized. He denies infant sprinkling as a system, and yet receives the living supporters of that system into full communion, empowered with more than ordinary influence by virtue of the office into which they have been chosen. Is this consistency?

He proclaims that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are

both ordinances of perpetual obligation. Nevertheless he allows one to be divided from the other, and permits the one to be neglected, provided the other be observed. He cannot dispense with Baptism in his public ministrations, and yet he can dispense with its practical manifestation in the government of his church. His judgement *discerns* and *approves* it, but his Charity, prevailing over his judgement, reconciles its partial neglect. Is this consistency.?

But since " it is appointed unto all men once to die " it is by no means extravagant to suppose that the Minister in question, will presently be called to receive the reward of his work, and to enter upon a heavenly and a perfect state—upon which, the Church will require another Leader, in the choice of whom its component members will have an equal and an individual voice. Now upon the supposition that there are more *un*baptized members, than baptized in the church, (and upon the mixed communion system this cannot be either improbable or impossible) what would be the consequence ?

In the event of the *un*baptized portion giving their united preference in favor of an *un*baptized Minister and desiring him to take the oversight, how could it be prevented ? What could prevent the conversion of the Baptist into an Independent church ? It would be argued that if the majority of the members were *un*baptized, and baptism was not an essential, why should any eligible minister be rejected, simply because he, like a large proportion of the people, had never been baptized ? It would be pleaded that it did not affect his doctrinal statements—that it was an ordinance that had occasioned much diversity of opinion—and that, as

a mixed communion Church, could be no impediment to the invitation of an *un*-baptized Pastor !

Certainly no Church could, consistently, require their Minister to have observed an ordinance which a large proportion of their members had never regarded, and which, as a body, they designated a non-essential. And therefore the system of mixed-communion is more fearful in its *remote* consequences than might be conceived upon a superficial examination. If we may be allowed to personify it, we should compare it to a Stranger, very prepossessing in his appearance, but upon phrenological inspection having the organ of *destructiveness* very powerfully developed.

It may be advanced, that it is not likely that in a baptist church, there would be more *un*baptized than baptized Members; but it is far from logical, when considering the consistency or inconsistency of any system, to speculate upon what is likely, or what is unlikely. We are to consider what is *possible.* And as it is *possible* for a baptist church to become Independent, upon the mixed-communion discipline, its inconsistency must be proved to a demonstration.

But we ask even the "*Baptist,*" who pleads for *mixed*-communion, whether he could, consistently with his principles, reject a Minister, to whose ministry he was attached, simply because he was *un*baptized? How could he term it a non-essential, justify its non-observance by many fellow members, and then plead it essential for a Minister? Is an ordinance more essential for a Minister than a Deacon, or a private member of the Church?—By no means.—Therefore even the *baptized* members of any community, as well as the *un*baptized, to be true to their standard of *mixed*-communion, must (upon the sup-

position that they esteem his ministry) vote for a pastor, who has never been baptized, and station an Independent Minister over a professedly Baptist Church!

Thus whether we suppose the baptized, or *un*baptized Members to preponderate, the position is the same; inasmuch as an ordinance the Baptist requires not of a fellow member, or a deacon, he cannot equitably demand of a Minister.

On what grounds then can a mixed communion church on the broadest principles of christian charity, be justified in its procedure!

If it be consistent for a Baptist Minister to allow, what he believes to be a vestige of Popery, to be introduced into his church—if it be consistent for a Baptist Minister to allow the judgement of his flock to prevail against his own—if it be consistent for a Baptist Minister to divide the ordinances of Christ—if it be consistent for a Baptist Minister to suffer a form of discipline, which after his decease, may admit the transmutation of a Baptist into an Independent Church—We say, if these things be consistent, we are prepared to justify the Mixed-Communionist, as they are the inevitable sequences of his system.

But as we deem them most palpable *in*consistencies, and cannot receive that form of Charity that would sell our denomination into the hands of others, or sacrifice the ordinance of Baptism at its altar—as we cannot approve that ecclesiastical discipline which sets the judgement of the church above the convictions of the Minister, and which leaves him to amalgamate, what he considers popery, with protestantism—We do, with humility, though with an uncompromising decision, pronounce the mixed communion system incongruous and irregular,

and discern under the folds of its Charity, a sword to exterminate the Baptist denomination!

But let us proceed to examine the inconsistency of those mixed-communion Churches, which only acknowledge the *un*baptized as *communicants*, and not as *members*, exhibiting their charity on a scale more circumscribed than those to which we have just referred.

These Individuals allow their unbaptized Brethren to commune with them at the Lord s Table, but carefully proscribe them from any influence in the government of the Church, and not considering them as Members, refuse them admission to their private meetings. Of these we enquire, does the New Testament know any distinction between communicants and members? Does it reveal any difference between those who commune at the Lord's Table, giving some a voice in the church, and to others none? Does it pronounce persons proper characters to sit down with us at the ordinance of the Supper, and yet too inconsistent to be recognized as members of the church with which they habitually commune?

Is not this the device of man, distinguishing between communicant and communicant, and introducing discrepancies between those who meet to celebrate the Saviour's death, unknown in the days of the Apostles? They had all things common, and although, in relation to things temporal, that form of government was of short duration, as regards things spiritual, it was never to be abandoned. He who believed was baptized—he who was baptized was added to the church—he who was added to the church continued in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. Delightful connection, instituted by Jesus Christ the Lord and Lawgiver in Zion! Harmonious chain whose every link is dear to Heaven, and should be dear to us!

Divine Wisdom contrived this chain, let not human charity steal away the link of Baptism!

Holy Scripture invests every communicant at the Lord's Table with all the privileges of the militant church. If they have been introduced into the family, they can plead their birthright. They can enter a scriptural *caveat* against the circumscription of their spiritual advantages, and have an indisputable right to insist upon the demolition of that party wall, which human builders have erected to separate members and communicants.

Are *un*baptized communicants such dangerous persons, that their liberty must be denied them, and their hands fettered lest they should employ them to the injury of the church? Are they to be suspected? Are they to be esteemed as cyphers? If they are scriptural communicants, they are eligible members; and it is an infraction of the apostolical rule to forbid them admission, together with all the privileges attendant thereupon. If we could conscientiously admit them to the Table, without being baptized, we could not hesitate to acknowledge them members, seeing a manifest inconsistency in the denial of church fellowship to those who are allowed to participate in church ordinances.

If Charity admit them to the Table, then charity, to be consistent with herself, must admit them fully and unreservedly into Christian fellowship. If the consultation of their consciences give them a seat at the banquet of a Saviour's dying love, then the consultation of their consciences must admit them to membership. And if they, as unbaptized, are to commune with us at the Lord's Table, in this world, upon the plea that they will commune with us in heaven—so unquestionably we must, by parity of reason, break down the wall of partition between

membership and communion, because in heaven there will be no such distinction. Thus inspecting the premises so much valued by the Mixed-Communionist, we find they are far from substantial, and that there are seasons when even the Mixed-Communionist himself must quit them perceiving their danger.

But we have yet a more formidable charge to adduce against those who advocate the system of open communion that distinguishes between members and comunicants. We tell them, their communicants are either *in* the church, or *out of* the church. If in the church, they must be members of the church, and if not in the church, then the mixed-communionist, in administering the ordinance of the Lord's Supper to them, does assuredly administer it *out of the church*, which is contrary, not only to the revealed discipline of the primitive churches, but also opposed to his own acknowledged principles. Let those who plead for open communion, in this form, consider this assertion, that they administer the ordinance *out of* the church, to all communicants whom they will not recognize as members *in* the church, and we ask them, how can such a course be orthodox?

Lest these inferences should be evaded, we simply enquire, whether the *un*baptized communicants, are members of the church or not? Whether they are members of any section of the militant church? It will be answered—No. Then if they be members of no church, they are without the pale of the church—and if without the pale of the church, and the ordinance be admistered to them, unquestionably it must be extended beyond the sacred boundary which inspiration has fixed.

Vain indeed, it must be to plead "they are members of the church triumphant, and therefore eligible to com-

mune" for upon the same premises they must be pronounced eligible for full membership—Surely if because they are members of the church triumphant, they are eligible to commune, they must also be eligible for membership in the church militant, upon the same ground. And yet, the system of open-communion, now under consideration, ventures to separate between their title to communion, and their qualification to membership! Their practice infers, that Regeneration is the title to communion, while Baptism is the qualification for membership. But the analogy of Revelation sustains our conviction that he who is eligible for communion must be equally eligible for Membership. Or in other words, what Jesus Christ requires of a member, he requires of a communicant. It would baffle the eye of an Argus to detect a *scriptural* distinction between communicants and members!

How can *communion* scripturally take the precedence of *union?* As it is censurable and criminal in natural and civil respects, so is it in spiritual. Relationship is the root of interchange, and where the former is disputed, the latter should be denied. If relationship to Christ is a reason for communion, it is equally a reason for membership.

But in itself it is a reason for *neither*; for it is a secret until it is revealed through an open profession, and this open profession is made through the ordinance of Baptism. We cannot therefore act merely upon an implied or accredited relationship to Christ, but upon the manifestation of that relationship, in obedience to his commands.

Under the law *birth* made a man an Israelite, but *circumcision* entitled him to the privileges of citizenship, and was the sign of his extraction—so under the gospel,

it is *birth*, the *new birth*, that makes a man a Christian, but it is *Baptism* that entitles him to the privileges of church fellowship, and which openly distinguishes him from the world. What God is pleased to effect in the heart, is to be publicly advertized by a personal regard to his ordinances, and if this characterizing ordinance is to be neglected, or termed a non-essential, or a mere ceremony, unworthy an argument—upon the same reasoning every ordinance may be abolished, and no test of discipleship actually enforced, beyond an adherency to moral exellencies and precepts. Then every moral man, as the world terms it, may be a communicant! To say, that Baptism may be omitted, because it is not an essential to salvation, and simply an ordinance, is sentimental Antinomianism! Whether, therefore, we consider mixed-communion upon the broadest, or the more circumscribed plan, it is equally inconsistent. If a Minister be a Baptist, we presume he is so because he attaches some considerable importance to the *mode* and *subject* of baptism, otherwise he may as well be an Independent. If then he attach importance to the *mode* and *subject* of Baptism, how can he consistently lay both aside, as regards a large portion of his Members or communicants?

To espouse a certain denomination, and then to denounce its main characteristic, as a non-essential, reflects upon such an Individual the charge of multiplying sects and parties without any tenable or conscientious reason. And certainly if the discipline of Baptist and Independent Churches be the same—if the difference between them be merged in the private creed or opinion of the presiding Pastor, what objection can there be to the *unition* of the two denominations? Or why is not a Baptist an Independent, if Baptism be a non-essential? Or how can a man value his

principles, as a Baptist, who could preside over a church all of whose members were *un*baptized? This, of course, those Ministers could do, who advocate mixed-communion upon the broader principle.

VI. ANIMADVERSIONS UPON SOME OF THE STATEMENTS OF THE LATE REV. ROBERT HALL.

1. "That baptism is invariably a necessary condition of communion has long passed current in the Christian world, and been received by nearly all denominations of Christians."—HALL, *page* 4.

Why then, we ask, should the strict-communion principles be contemned? Principles that have been entertained and defended by "nearly all denominations of Christians"—according to the admission of the open communionist. Surely there is some deference due to the creed, which not merely *one*, but nearly *all* denominations, in past ages have revered. And if we be reluctant to part with principles which former centuries have cherished and esteemed, being ourselves impressed with their orthodoxy,—we remark, if we be reluctant to part with these principles for those espoused by comparatively few, and these few not only of modern standing, but almost all of them included under the head of "open Communion Baptists"—unquestionably our reluctance is rather creditable than censurable. We have, at least, the sanction of the *greatest* men of *all* denominations that ever lived and laboured in the militant church.

We are prepared to acknowledge that the foremost espousers of any particular denomination may err in their principles, under the influence of an undetected prejudice in favor of their individual sect. But when the leaders among *all* denominations, whether Episcopalian,

Independent, Baptist, or Wesleyan, concur in the belief that "Baptism is a necessary condition of communion," we are strongly impressed with the consistency of the application of the adage—"Vox populi, Vox Dei"—Nor do we feel disposed to join a wing of the army of Baptists, be it large or small, to invade a phalanx so ancient, so catholic and so beneficial. We most decidedly prefer what has long passed current in the Christian world, and has been received by nearly *all* denominations of Christians, to that which is comparatively the introduction of the present century, and which has only a wing of *one* denomination to defend it. Truth sustained by Apostolical precedent, and regarded by nearly all denominations through past ages, is too precious to be sacrificed at the altar of novelty, although there be some excellent, but mistaken men, among its builders.

That Baptism was, *with the Apostles,* a condition of communion is admitted by Mr. Hall in the following words. "The Apostles, it is acknowledged, admitted none to the Lord's Supper but such as were previously baptized." It is true he pleads they were *inspired* men, and could satisfy the mind of every honest enquirer, and therefore exercised a peculiar authority. But to us, it appears the extreme of inconsistency to argue, because the ministers of Christ are not now inspired as the Apostles were, that therefore instead of upholding what they have been taught to revere as the ordinances of Christ, they must defer to the opinion of those who receive instruction from them, and part with scriptural uniformity because they are not infallible. We ask whether the admission of our *fallibility,* lays us under obligation, as the ministers of Christ, to sanction the administration of spiritual ordinances in a manner we consider carnal?

And far be it from us to espouse a system of discipline which can only be justified, by endeavouring to prove there is *no* connection between the ordinances of Christ. Yet the late Mr. Hall admits he could only establish his principles of open-communion, by striving to overturn the creed of Episcopalians, Independents, Wesleyans, and strict-communion Baptists—all of whom agree that there *is a connection* between Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

2. "An individual convinced of Baptism, and not being baptized, alleging that it is not essential to salvation, that it is a mere external rite, and that some of the holiest men have died in the neglect of it, *is disqualified for Christian communion.*"—HALL, *p.* 13.

How does this assertion accord with Mr. Hall's opinion that we ought not to be "more fastidious in the selection of the members of the church militant, than Christ in choosing the members of the church triumphant?" (*p.* 40.)

There are many good men, who to their shame neglect Baptism, pleading it is a non-essential. We believe however they are *good* men, and that Christ will receive them at last, though they neglect this ordinance. These, however, Mr. Hall disqualifies for Christian communion, and yet subsequently charges others with "fastidiousness" in being more precise than Jesus Christ. Surely he himself is fastidious upon his own principles.

And why, we would ask again, should any be disqualified for Christian communion on account of the wilful neglect of Baptism, if, as Mr. Hall wished to establish, there were no connexion between Baptism and the Lord's Supper? Surely, if they have no relation to each other, the wilful neglect of one can be no solid reason why any individual should be refused the other. Here again Mr. Hall contravened his own principles.

We heartily wish, every minister of mixed communion discipline would examine his *unbaptized* communicants, and treat them according to the plan prescribed by their favorite Mr. Hall. That is to exclude all, as disqualified for Christian communion, who are convinced Baptism is scriptural, and, nevertheless, wilfully neglect it—assigning most frivolous excuses.

We believe some have not light enough to discern the ordinance, as we discern it; we are bound to credit their assertion that they do not perceive it—but we are equally sure, that at this time, there are many unbaptized persons habitually communing with baptist churches, who are fully convinced of the propriety of the rite, and who openly avow that conviction, while they neglect it. Now we call upon the Ministers of mixed communion discipline to pursue the plan laid down by the champion of their form of government, and to refuse all such persons admission to the Table, Mr. Hall having said, " without hesitation they are disqualified for Christian communion." In the present day, there is, however, open-communion for the wilfully negligent, as well as the sincerely mistaken.

It seems a little singular that an able writer like Mr. Hall, after having in page 13 disqualified for Christian communion those who were convinced of Baptism and neglected it—should only in page 15 complain of his " *opponents* deeming a vast majority of Christians disqualified for Christian fellowship, while their pretensions to acceptance with God, and a title to eternal life are undisputed !" In page 13, he deems many disqualified for Christian communion, whom he would acknowledge Christians, and yet in page 15 he condemns his opponents for following his example.

Mr. Hall did not doubt that many were accepted of

God who neglected baptism, knowing it to be an ordinance of Christ; nevertheless Mr. Hall pronounced them to be disqualified for Christian communion—consequently Mr. Hall pronounced some to be disqualified for Christian communion whom he had no doubt were accepted of God. This demonstrates that acceptance with God was not always Mr. Hall's *maximum*, but that he would sometimes insist as well upon the *minimum*, viz. the observance of the ordinance on the part of those who were convinced of its propriety. And, therefore, why complain of those, who from conscientious convictions could not lay aside the *minimum* in *any* case, esteeming the command of Christ, the rule of christian conduct, and christian sincerity no plea for its invasion!

3. Mr. Hall's self-contradictions in juxta-position:—

I would only remark here that all I have seen and heard concurs to convince me that the practice of strict communion rests, almost entirely, on authority, and that were the influence of a few great names withdrawn, it would sink under its own weight.

Preface, page 4.

It is not surprising the Baptists should have considered Baptism a necessary condition of communion, since it has long passed current in the Christian Church and has been received by nearly all denominations of Christians.

page 4.

The Apostles it is acknowledged admitted none to the Lord's Supper, but those previously baptized.

page 8.

The one statement represents strict communion, as dependent upon the influence of a few great names—and the other allows it to have been believed by nearly all denominations, and supported by apostolical precedent! Can two statements be more at various with each other?

The Baptists in confining their communion to those whom they deem baptized, act precisely on the same principle with all other Christians, who assume it for granted

It is too much to expect that a habit of treating all other Christians as aliens from the fold of Christ, and unworthy of a participation of the privileges of his church can be

that Baptism is an essential preliminary to the reception of the sacrament—therefore the severity of censure towards them should be softened.

page 5.

generally *un*accompanied with an asperity of temper, and a depreciation of the virtues of those whom they treat with such rigour. Conceiving themselves to be a highly privileged class as the only legitimate members of his Church, they are almost inevitably disposed to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think.

page 48.

The one statement affirms the Baptists only act upon the same principles as all other Christians—and that therefore they should not be censured. The other is as full of acrimony and censure against them, as any lines we ever read either from an Episcopalian or an Independent.

We have no hesitation in affirming that individual disqualified for Christian communion who satisfied of Baptism, refuses to be baptized, alleging it is not essential to salvation, a mere external rite, and that some of the holiest men have died in the neglect of it.

pages 12, 13.

He who is accepted of Christ ought also to be accepted of his brethren, and he whose right to the thing signified is not questioned, possesses an undoubted right to the outward sign. *page* 2.

The persons they exclude from their communion are a part of the flock of Christ, and of that Church he has bought with his blood.

page 25.

In the one statement Mr. Hall disqualifies for Christian communion all who convinced of baptism, are unbaptized. In the other he contends that He who is accepted of Christ ought to be also of his brethren, and condemns his opponents for excluding any part of his church. Either therefore Mr. Hall pursues what he upbraids in others, or he must un-christianize all who convinced of baptism are *un*-baptized.

"With mingled surprise and indignation they behold us making pretensions which no other denomination of Protestants assumes, placing ourselves in an attitude of hostility towards the whole Christian world, and virtually claiming to be the only church of Christ upon earth.

page 42.

"The recollection of this (that Baptism has been considered, not only by Baptists but by all denominations, a necessary condition of church fellowship) may suffice to rebut the ridicule, and silence the clamour of those, who loudly condemn the Baptists for a proceeding which, were they but to change their opinion on the subject of baptism, their own principles would compel them to adopt."

page 6.

Here Mr. Hall is found, first in the *justification* of the charges adduced against the Strict-communionist—and then in the *refutation* of them. In page 42, Mr. Hall pronounces the Strict-communionists guilty of "bigotry," and in page 6, attempts to "silence the clamour of those" who only do the same as he, himself, has done. In page 42 they are "guilty,"—in page 6, they are "not guilty!"

4. "It deserves the serious consideration of our opponents, that they are contending for that *schism* in the body of Christ against which he so fervently prayed." (page 28.)

Surely where there has been no *union*, there can be no *schism* or separation. We may believe well, and hope favorably of many, whom we cannot, nevertheless, suffer to disturb what we conscientiously deem the scriptural discipline of Christ's militant church. So discerning a man as Mr. Hall must have seen, had he exercised his penetration, a decided difference between Christian *character* and Christian *consistency;* and he must have known that the latter is in many cases difficult to be traced, while the former cannot, perhaps, be fairly questioned. Say, in the case of a person convinced of baptism, refusing

to be baptized—his Christian *character*, we will readily admit, but his Christian *consistency* we will strenuously deny. He is a member of Christ's mystical body, and nevertheless not eligible for Christian communion at the Lord's Table, either in our estimation or Mr. Hall's, though Mr. Hall has *elsewhere* said, "he who is accepted of Christ ought to be accepted of his brethren."

Now we ask the followers of Mr. Hall, how he could be consistent with himself, in refusing the Lord's Supper to a member of Christ, because though convinced of baptism, he refused to be baptized, after having said "we ought not be more particular in choosing members for the church militant, than Christ in selecting them for the church triumphant." Here is a case where even Mr. Hall proscribes from communion a member of Christ's mystical body! And upon what ground? Not that he questioned such an one's Christian *character*, but only his *consistency*. Precisely then upon these premises do we strict communionists proceed, gladly esteeming Christian *character* wherever we discern it, but in no case allowing the lack of Christian *consistency* to prevail with us in disturbing the primitive discipline of Christ's Church.

And if we were disposed to throw back the undeserved and unproved accusation of schism to its author, we might, with some consistency, enquire whether *their* conduct bears not the more manifest semblance of schism, who separate themselves *in name* from other denominations, who call themselves Baptists, who thus multiply sects, at the same time confessing the ordinance of baptism should be sacrificed on the altar of fraternal affection! Why are they Sectarians? Why are they Baptists, if no distinction in discipline is regarded?

We consider although the fact of Regeneration is a

qualification for admission into the church triumphant, simply considered, it is not the *only* pre-requisite to admission into the church militant. The principle possessed must be developed, and this developement should take place through the observance of that important ordinance which so beautifully and ostensibly proclaims the separation between the church and the world.

In the days of the Apostles, while faith was doubtlessly the fitness for admission into the church triumphant, Faith and Baptism were necessary to admission into the church militant, according to the confession of Mr. Hall, that "the apostles admitted none to the Lord's Table, but those who had been previously baptized". And therefore, as we have already shown, it is neither logical nor scriptural to plead the discipline of the church triumphant,as an excuse for the invasion of primitive observances and apostolical precedent.

It is extravagant presumption to infer that what God does, in the exercise of his undisputed prerogatives, we also may do—his *word* is the limit of creature operation, and if regardless of this we make his *will* our directory, we shall surely err. When man ventures to act from his knowledge of the *Divine will,* instead of from a regard to the *Divine word,* he becomes a speculator; and to dwell upon the *Divine Purpose* as a plea for the neglect of *Divine precept* will assuredly make a cloak for Antinomianism ! It is no doubt the *purpose* of God to save many Christians, who are very inconsistent this side the grave—for we read of some who are to be saved "yet so as by fire"—nevertheless such a purpose, secret with Himself, will justify no Minister of Christ, in allowing the disregard, or mutilation of the ordinances of Christianity.

It is not unfrequently said, that the strict communionist acts as though the Table were his own instead of his Lord's—but indeed it is far more easy to adduce accusations than to demonstrate the accuracy of them. The fact is, were the Table *our's*, we should feel we had a discretionary power, we should consider we were entitled to do as we pleased, and our sympathies would unquestionably induce us to admit every individual applicant. But as the Table is not our's, but the Lord's, we dare not exercise any discretionary power, we are not to invite whom we please, we cannot suffer our charity to transgress. And just as we have no right to give away what belongs to another, pleading Christian benevolence, so we have no authority to invite to the Table of another, those whom we conscientiously believe are not entitled to commune.

Consequently our opponents are not candid in their charges, inasmuch as the reason we forbid them to commune, is not with a view to usurp an unauthorized dictation, but with a desire to repel every encroachment upon apostolical precedent. And if they think we glory in their seclusion, or take delight in our separation from them, while we would patiently endure the result of their false impressions concerning us, we would assure them of their mistake, and affirm that it is to us no ordinary pang that we are compelled to refuse them. The moment we are prepared to plead the non-importance of the believer's baptism, that same moment we shall be prepared to prove that the existence of the Baptist denomination is purely schismatical.

The late Mr. Hall's reasoning that though the Apostles admitted none to the Lord's Supper, but those previously baptized—we nevertheless may; is upon a parallel with the reasoning of many Episcopalians, that though the

Apostles did not baptize infants—we nevertheless may. Therefore, if upon such reasoning, we could become mixed-communionists, we could as easily become Episcopalians upon the same ground. Invade the Apostles example in one point, and it follows that their discipline may be totally abrogated, under the various pleas of "Charity," "Sincerity," "Times and Seasons," "Climate," &c. &c. If we invade it to please the Mixed-Communionist, and to exhibit our love towards him, then we may invade it to please the Episcopalian, and to exhibit our love towards him. But rather we hope to shew our love towards both, while conforming to neither. We will love them, whether they will love us or not. We hold it as much our duty to love them, as we believe it our duty to forbid them, as unbaptized, admission to the Lord's Table.

And it seems to us that upon the mixed-communion system, every man ought to be deemed a Baptist—whether Episcopalian, or Independent, Wesleyan or Quaker. For if we are to receive every individual because he has been baptized in the way he prefers and believes scriptural, will it not be very uncharitable, subsequently, to tell him he has not been baptized at all? If *his* method of Baptism suffice for membership, surely it is tacitly acknowledged as Baptism. The Episcopalian thinks he has been baptized, and so the Independent, and so the Wesleyan, and so the Quaker—consequently, if upon their conceptions of Baptism we receive them into communion, charity bids us deem them no longer as *un*baptized.

VII. A FEW CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

1. It is not a little surprising that the late Mr. Hall should have imagined, the cause he advocated would be advantaged by shewing the difference of opinion which

subsisted between the late Mr. Fuller and Mr. Kinghorn, upon the subject of communion, although they were both strict-communionists. As though any diversity of opinion upon the subject, between two of its advocates, could possibly prove the subject itself inconsistent. Good men who believe in the atonement, the millenium, or the first resurrection, differ much in their views concerning these doctrines, nevertheless the *truth* of these doctrines is not to be questioned, on account of the various discrepancies in the expositions of those who espouse them.

And if indeed strict communion could be demonstrated incorrect, because all who have vindicated it have not wielded the sword of controversy in the same way, then mixed-communion, by the same rule, would be equally exploded. Inasmuch as what mixed communicants upon the *broad* principle defend and pursue, mixed communionists upon the *contracted* principle condemn and discard, and what mixed communionist upon the *contracted* principle condemn and discard, mixed communionists upon the *broad* principle defend and pursue. Therefore, if any system is to be decried, because its advocates differ in defending it, certainly mixed-communion will be among the first to be abandoned.

2. Either the existence of the Baptist denomination is necessary, or it is not. It is either based upon principle or upon schism. If it be founded upon schism, its speedy extinction must be heartily wished, if upon principle, its conservation must be dear to its advocates. We must however suppose every consistent Baptist to maintain that his denomination is founded upon principle; and, therefore, it must be his bounden duty to cherish what may minister, and to disown what may menace injury to its extension.

Now Mr. Hall admits, whether "mixed-communion will have the effect of rapidily extending the Baptist denomination, as such, is uncertain" And he adds "were the practice universally to prevail, the mixture of Baptists and Pædo-Baptists, in Christian societies would probably, ere long, be such,that *the appellation of baptist might be found not so properly applicable to churches as individuals.*" Consequently if the champion of mixed-communion acknowledged that the spread of the system he espoused is calculated to destroy the Baptists, as a denomination, or as Baptist churches—unless we are prepared to welcome our annihilation as a public body, and to be deemed as a few *peculiarists*, among the body of Independents, we must zealously and scripturally contend against the innovations he has sought to maintain. Strict communion or entire extinction as a denomination, are the alternatives from which, according to the mixed-communionist, we must make our choice—and we feel that we should be unworthy of the name of Baptist, if we did not choose the former.

3. It is reasonable to expect that as long as the world lasts, there will be the prevalence of a compromising spirit, under the guise of Christian charity, and that men who adhere to apostolical precedent, while the multitude avowedly invade it, will be more or less unpopular, and more or less misrepresented. Religion, while its forms and ceremonies, are unconnected with self-denial, is welcomed by many, who immediately oppose and refuse it when it assumes an attitude inimical to their natural feelings and prejudices. And therefore that form of worship, or that mode of regarding an ordinance, which is furthest from fashion and human inclination will always be the least preferred Thus he who seeks popularity, or pants after general

estimation, is the very last who should avow himself a Baptist!

The nearer we imitate Christ and his Apostles, the more repulsive will our religion appear to the carnal mind; and he who is not prepared to be accounted "as the offscouring of all things" (though the refinement of the times may employ milder terms of censure) will never summon resolution sufficient to take the Bible, and the Bible only for his guide. Expediency will insert many a parenthesis. Many Christians are ashamed of the cross, Reader are you?

We are far from desirous to call in question the sincerity of our mixed-communion brethren in the course they pursue—we wish to publish no ungenerous insinuations against them---we can easily believe the instigators of such a system were betrayed into it by a deep-toned sympathy and unmeasured affection for their *un*-baptized fellow Christians. The feeling we esteem, though we censure its invasion of apostolical precedent.

On the other hand, we cannot perceive how we, in the defence of strict communion, can be fairly charged with bigotry or singularity, inasmuch as almost all Episcopalians and Independents, as well as ourselves, require their communicants to have been baptized. And surely, if the Episcopalian and Independent enter their *caveat* against the neglect of what *they consider* Baptism, and regard its observance as a condition of church fellowship, the Baptist, to be consistent with his principles, must be equally precise. Else why is he a Baptist, if he lay less emphasis upon the due administration of the ordinance of baptism than other denominations? We ask, why is he a Baptist if he receive communicants who have never been baptized? For the same Charity which requires the

omission of the rite, as truly demands the annihilation of the denominational distinction ! If Charity allow a Baptist church to be composed of *un*baptized members, then *consistency* demands that it be no longer designated a Baptist church. When the *discipline* of any church, and the *denomination* by which it is distinguished, are opposed ; it is time either the *discipline* or the *denomination* were changed.

We conclude by reminding those who are enquiring upon this subject, that the late Mr. Hall, acknowledged " the Apostles admitted none to the Lord's Table, but such as were previously baptized." (page 8). That he also admitted " those were disqualified for Christian communion, who, convinced of the propriety of the ordinance of baptism, nevertheless neglected it as a non-essential" (page 13). That he further observed " were mixed-communion to prevail universally, the appellation of Baptist would be found not so properly applicable to churches as individuals." Leaving us to infer that Baptist churches, would, as such, upon the *mixed* communion system eventually be entirely annihilated. These, therefore, being the convictions of the ablest pen that ever advocated mixed-communion, the question is no longer so trivial as this—Shall we be *mixed*-communion ?—or shall we be *strict* communion ? But rather,—SHALL THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION BE PERPETUATED OR SHALL IT BE EXTINGUISHED ?

THE END.

Gardiner & Son, Printers, Princes Street, Cavendish Square.